



Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-101
Friday
24 May 1991

N O T I C E

NEW FBIS REPORT ON SOVIET REPUBLIC AFFAIRS

In May FBIS will begin publication of a new report entitled ***FBIS Report/Soviet Union: Republic Affairs***. The report will contain open-source material from the Soviet Union on a wide range of republic political, economic, military and social issues. Material on the Soviet republics that was previously published in the JPRS reports ***Soviet Union: Political Affairs*** and ***Soviet Union: Economic Affairs*** will now appear in the new ***FBIS Report/Soviet Union: Republic Affairs***. The ***Daily Report: Soviet Union*** will continue to publish current material on the Soviet republics, but less time-sensitive items that formerly appeared in that publication will now be found in ***FBIS Report/Soviet Union: Republic Affairs***.

TO SUBSCRIBE:

U.S. Government

U.S. Government subscribers to JPRS reports ***Soviet Union: Political Affairs***; ***Soviet Union: Economic Affairs***; and ***Daily Report: Soviet Union*** will automatically receive the new ***FBIS Report/Soviet Union: Republic Affairs*** report.

U.S. Government subscribers who do not currently subscribe to the reports mentioned above may obtain subscriptions to ***FBIS Report/Soviet Union: Republic Affairs*** at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P O Box 2604, Washington, DC. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, DC, 20301 (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771).

Public Sector

The public may subscribe to ***FBIS Report/Soviet Union: Republic Affairs*** through the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 (Telephone: (703) 487-4630). Subscription rates will be provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers.

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-101

CONTENTS

24 May 1991

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Delegation 'Welcomes' U.S. Chemical Arms Plan [TASS]	1
U.S. Plans Space-Based Missile Tracking System [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 May]	1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Foreign Ministry's Churkin Briefs Press	2
Lauds Perez de Cuellar on Afghanistan [TASS]	2
On U.S. Pressure Against Cuba [TASS]	2
Personnel in Ethiopia To Return [Radio Rossii]	2
'Deep Concern' Over Stoph, Kessler [TASS]	2
On Gandhi; DPRK Nuclear Verification [TASS]	3
U.S.-USSR Afghan Contacts Reported [INTERFAX]	3
Ignatenko on G-7 Meeting, Cuban Missiles [IZVESTIYA 23 May]	3
Moscow Conference on G-7, Economy Reported [IZVESTIYA 22 May]	4

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Further Reportage on Moiseyev Visit, Arms Talks	6
Meets Bush, Baker, Cheney [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 May]	6
Talks 'Difficult But Useful' [TASS]	6
CFE Negotiations, Visit Viewed [INTERFAX]	6
Army Paper on Talks [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 May]	7
Paper Views Prospects for Gates' CIA Nomination [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 May]	7
Bush Cited on 'Support' for Gorbachev, Summit [PRAVDA 22 May]	8
House Endorses Military Appropriations Bill [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 May]	8
Riga Reception Marks U.S. Consul's Departure [BALTFAX]	8

China

Anti-West Rapprochement With PRC Urged [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 May]	9
Chinese Patrol Boat Strays in Amur River [TRUD 18 May]	11
Ivashko Receives Friendship Delegation Head [PRAVDA 23 May]	11

Near East & South Asia

Yanayev Heads Delegation to Gandhi Funeral [TASS]	11
Delegation Arrives [TASS]	11
Yanayev Visits Gandhi's Widow [TASS]	11
CPSU CC Secretariat Condolences on Ghandi [PRAVDA 23 May]	12
CPSU Expresses Condolences at Indian Embassy [TASS]	12
Manayenkov Leads CPSU Group to Afghanistan	12
Meets Party Aktiv [PRAVDA 17 May]	12
Manayenkov Speaks to Press [TASS]	12
Ends Visit, Departs [TASS]	12
Observer on Prospects for Afghan Settlement [TASS]	13
Petrovskiy Meets Afghan UN Representative [IZVESTIYA 17 May]	13

East Europe

Further on Hungarian Foreign Minister Visit	13
Bessmertnykh Comments on Talks [TASS]	13
MTI on Talks With Bessmertnykh [Budapest]	14
Ministers Brief Journalists [Budapest Radio]	14
Jeszenszky Interviewed on Talks [Moscow International]	15
Jeszenszky Interviewed on Relations [Moscow Radio]	15
Churkin on Treaty Preparations [Moscow Radio]	16
CSFR's Dubcek Continues Moscow Visit	16
Meets Gorbachev, Comments [Moscow International]	16
Received by Lukyanov [PRAVDA 22 May]	17
Returns Home, Comments [IZVESTIYA 23 May]	17
Pavlov, Bulgarian Prime Ministers Discuss Treaty [IZVESTIYA 18 May]	17
CPSU's Ivashko Receives Bulgaria's Tomov [PRAVDA 20 May]	17

West Europe

Further Reportage on Andreotti Visit	17
Talks With Gorbachev	17
Gorbachev, Andreotti News Conference [Moscow Radio]	18
Talks With Pavlov [TASS]	27
Concludes Visit, Departs [Moscow Radio]	27
Gorbachev-Andreotti Talks Viewed [INTERFAX]	27

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Promulgates Security Bodies Law [TASS]	29
Index-Linked Incomes Bill Faces Criticism [TASS]	29
Supreme Soviet Aide Comments on Exit, Entry Law [PRAVDA 22 May]	30
Hero of Socialist Labor Award To Be Abolished [Moscow TV]	30

Political & Social

Deputies Launch 'Movement of Constructive Forces' [IZVESTIYA 23 May]	30
'Consensus' Association of Deputies' Groups Formed [IZVESTIYA 23 May]	31
Bunich Claims Majority for 'Progressive Reforms' [MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI No. 18]	32
'Soyuz' Spokesman Kim Denies Charges of Extremism [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 May]	32
Gorbachev Meets Georgian Representative in Moscow [Radio Rossii]	33
Gorbachev Attends Leaseholders Congress [TASS]	33
Secretary Luchinskiy Visits Komsomol Offices [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 22 May]	33
Ministers Increase Compensation for Miners [Moscow Radio]	34
Republic Procurators Attend Procuracy Session [TASS]	34
Editors, Publishers Protest Price Increases [PRAVDA 23 May]	34
Poll Shows Fewer Favor Authoritarian Solutions [MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI No. 18]	35
Spokesman on New Exit Law, Emigration Figures [TASS]	36
Survey on Reasons for Emigration [INTERFAX]	36
TASS Reviews Press for 24 May [TASS]	37
Comparison of Draft Income Indexation Plan	37

Economic

Academic Ponders Economic Policy's Future [PRAVDA 23 May]	38
Economic Crimes Continue To Increase [INTERFAX]	39
Moscow Starts To Sell Small Retail Outlets [IZVESTIYA 23 May]	40

Share-Holding Operations to Increase [INTERFAX]	40
Russian Academy of Enterprise Begins Work [Moscow Radio]	40

Military

Yazov Addresses Service Veterans Conference [TASS]	40
General Explains New Navy Volunteer Program [IZVESTIYA 21 May]	41

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Estonia's Ruutel Sees 'New Period of Crisis' [Tallinn Radio]	42
Estonian Border Guards Reinforced, On Alert [Tallinn Radio]	42
Estonia Adopts Regulations on Property Claims [Tallinn TV]	42
Latvian Delegation Statement on USSR Talks [Riga Radio]	42
Latvian Communists Protest Dimanis Expulsion [BALTFAX]	43
Latvian Head Postpones Trip Because of Incidents [Riga Radio]	43
Riga Labor Collectives Stage Protest Meeting [Moscow TV]	43
Lithuanian Prime Minister Leaves for Moscow [Vilnius Radio]	43
Lithuania Protests Soviet 'Terror Acts' [Vilnius Radio]	44
Moiseyev Denies Paratroopers Moved to Lithuania [PRAVDA 24 May]	44
Butkevicius Comments on Attacks in Lithuania [Vilnius Radio]	44
Official Gives Landsbergis View of Border Attacks [Vilnius Radio]	45
20,000 Farmers Demonstrate in Vilnius [Vilnius Radio]	45

RSFSR

Gorbachev, Yeltsin To Sign 'Important Document' [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 24 May]	45
Congress of Peoples Deputies Continues Work [Moscow TV]	45
Constitutional Amendments Discussed [TASS]	46
More on New Presidency Law [TASS]	46
Yeltsin on Relations With Center [INTERFAX]	47
Zhirinovskiy Addresses Congress [Moscow TV]	47
Zhirinovskiy's Platform Detailed [Moscow TV]	48
Statement Opposes Zhirinovskiy [Moscow Radio]	51
Communist Group Criticizes Zhirinovskiy [Radio Rossii]	52
Deputy Assails Zhirinovskiy [Moscow TV]	52
Tuleyev Launches Campaign [TASS]	53
Tuleyev on Presidential Policy [Moscow TV]	53
Bakatin Outlines Policy [TASS]	54
Makashov Details Program [Moscow TV]	55
Yeltsin Comments on Candidacy, Platform [IZVESTIYA 24 May]	56
Yeltsin Expresses Views on Russian Communists [Moscow Radio]	60
Ryzhkov Presidential Platform Outlined [Moscow Radio]	60
Bakatin News Conference on Candidacy Cited [PRAVDA 23 May]	61
Bakatin Campaign for Presidency Viewed [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 May]	61
Presidential Candidate Tuleyev Interviewed [Moscow Radio]	61
Presidential Candidate Ryzhkov Interviewed [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 14 May]	63

Western Republics

Minsk Committee Decides To Suspend Strike [INTERFAX]	68
Ukrainian Cabinet Appointments Examined [Kiev Radio]	69
Clashes, Arrests Reported in Moldova [INTERFAX]	69
Moldovan Legislature Views Candidates [INTERFAX]	69

Caucasus

Armenian Council on Emergency Situation Meets [Yerevan Radio]	69
Plight of 'Deported' Karabakh Armenians Protested [IZVESTIYA 22 May]	70
Armenian-Azerbaijani Border Situation Reported [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 May]	70
Azerbaijan, Armenia Cease-Fire Deals Cited [PRAVDA 23 May]	71
Azerbaijan Urges RSFSR To Show Respect [TASS]	71
Mutalibov Meets With USSR's Velichko, Anfimov [Baku Radio]	71
Azerbaijan Presidium Names Council of Ministers [Baku Radio]	71

Central Asia

Russia, Kazakhstan Complete Talks on Accords [IZVESTIYA 22 May]	72
Prime Minister Pavlov Visits Tashkent 22 May [Moscow Radio]	72
Comments on Reason for Tour [Moscow Radio]	72
Kyrgystan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan Sign Accord [Moscow Radio]	73

Delegation 'Welcomes' U.S. Chemical Arms Plan
*LD2305165891 Moscow TASS in English 1539 GMT
23 May 91*

[By TASS correspondent Vitaliy Makarchev]

[Text] Geneva May 23 TASS—The Soviet delegation welcomes new American initiatives in the field of banning chemical weapons as a contribution to the preparation of a convention on a complete ban of chemical weapons and the elimination of its stocks, Soviet delegation head Sergey Batsanov said in today's address to the Geneva disarmament conference.

Most participants in the negotiations, including the USSR, consider it expedient to ban the use of chemical weapons. We welcome the new position of the United States, which opens the way towards a prompt agreement on one of the main commitments of the states under the convention, the Soviet delegation head said.

The opening of the current session of the conference was marked by a notable event: On May 16, the U.S. delegation formally submitted to the conference its new proposals based on the U.S. President George Bush's statement of May 13 on the chemical weapons ban.

The American proposals, he said, offer major potential for progress towards an agreement on a range of still disputed matters. This is connected above all with the declared readiness of the United States to pledge not to use chemical weapons under any circumstances, including in retaliation, and to fully liquidate all stocks of chemical weapons and the facilities for their production within ten years after the convention goes into effect. This inspires hope, the Soviet delegation head said, that two of the crucial unresolved problems will at last be solved.

The Soviet Union pledged to sign the future convention and become its initial member first unilaterally in 1989, then on a bilateral basis with the United States in 1990 and finally jointly with the CSCE participants. We consider it important for other states to follow these good examples, Batsanov said.

U.S. Plans Space-Based Missile Tracking System
*PM2305150191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 23 May 91 First Edition p 5*

[TASS report: "New ABM System"]

[Text] New York, 22 May—The U.S. Army is developing [razrabatyvat] a new tactical ABM system with space-based elements, which is to replace in the mid-nineties the Patriot missile complexes used by U.S. troops during the war in the Persian Gulf. U.S. journalists were told this on Tuesday by General Robert Hammond, who heads the U.S. Army's strategic defense command.

To control the new system it is planned to place sensors in space, which are to fix the launch point of any enemy missile, compute its flight trajectory, and transmit these data to ABM complexes deployed in regions of combat operations, AP reports.

The new system provides for the creation [sozdaniye] of at least two new missile complexes designed to intercept and destroy enemy rocket projectiles at various altitudes. One of the missile complexes being developed [razrabatyvat] is designed to defend a theater of military operations at a considerably greater altitude than the Patriot, which was developed [razrabatyvat] mainly for operations against low-flying aircraft. Brigadier General Morgan Gillette told journalists visiting a scientific research complex in Huntsville (Alabama) that the U.S. Army is expected to receive the first consignment of 40 such missiles by the mid-nineties.

Foreign Ministry's Churkin Briefs Press**Lauds Perez de Cuellar on Afghanistan***LD2305134491 Moscow TASS in English 1320 GMT
23 May 91*

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Igor Peskov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—The statement by the U.N. secretary-general on an Afghan settlement, he made last Tuesday, is an impressive contribution to the settlement of the Afghan problem, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today.

Principles for an Afghan settlement contained in the statement, including the establishment of a transition period, free elections to form a broadly-based government and an end to hostilities and arms supplies to the warring sides, break ground for a constructive discussion by Afghans of a comprehensive solution of the conflict, a solution based on the balance of interests, the spokesman continued.

Churkin expressed hope that "ideas based on the present realities and interests of the Afghan people, who are tired of bloodshed, will prevail" among the Afghan opposition.

For its part, Churkin said, the Soviet Union is ready to look for ways of settling the Afghan problem in line with principles, on which the statement by the U.N. secretary-general is based.

On U.S. Pressure Against Cuba*LD2305145491 Moscow TASS in English 1411 GMT
23 May 91*

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Igor Peskov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—The Soviet Union took note of U.S. President George Bush's recent public statement, its stated desire to normalise U.S.-Cuban relations and absence of aggressive plans against that country on the part of the U.S., a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a briefing in Moscow today.

Vitaliy Churkin noted that the Soviet Union, which consistently favoured establishing normal relations between the two countries, could have welcomed such statements if they had not been accompanied by accusations against the Cuban leadership and peremptory demands that infringed on the sovereign rights of the Cuban people.

Guided by the ideas of new political thinking, the USSR supports democratic transformations across the world, including in Latin America, Churkin said.

At the same time, the Soviet Union is convinced that an evolution of political processes in any country must be

primarily rooted in the national soil and internal logic of socio-political development.

Attempts at outside interference in this process, various methods of power pressure, including continuing and toughening power pressure and whipping up tensions are counterproductive, and this fully applies to U.S. actions vis-a-vis Cuba, Churkin stressed.

Personnel in Ethiopia To Return*LD2305145891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network
in Russian 1330 GMT 23 May 91*

[Text] Vitaliy Churkin, official representative of the USSR Foreign Ministry, told journalists at a briefing today that Soviet specialists will be evacuated from Ethiopia in the near future.

'Deep Concern' Over Stoph, Kessler*LD2305163591 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1522 GMT 23 May 91*

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Igor Peskov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, May 23 (TASS)—"Deep concern" in connection with the arrest of former prominent politicians of the GDR, Willi Stoph, chairman of the Council of Ministers; and Heinz Kessler, minister for national defense, and two other members of the GDR National Defence Council was expressed today by Vitaliy Churkin, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration.

The former members of the GDR leadership have been accused of "instigating murder on the border between the two Germanys." Speaking at a briefing, Vitaliy Churkin said that this step cannot be regarded separately from the campaign launched in the FRG a long time ago to discredit left-wing forces in the country and to create an atmosphere of intolerance around "political dissidents", primarily around members of the Party of Democratic Socialism. The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman expressed the view that such actions are evidently also aimed at distracting the attention of the German public from the deterioration of the situation on the territory of the former GDR.

Vitaliy Churkin noted that those who were in office in the GDR acted in certain historical conditions, at the time of the "cold war," which affected the nature of the decisions they adopted.

These were also the circumstances which affected the legislation that provided for certain measures to stop violations of the state border. On the basis of currently existing views and current political reality, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed, these measures can be assessed in various ways: They can also be condemned, but that "does not give one any reason to bring criminal charges."

Speaking about the version circulated in the FRG on the attempt by Heinz Kessler, former GDR defense minister, to illegally leave for the USSR and the actions envisioned in this connection by the German authorities, Vitaliy Churkin said that the USSR Foreign Ministry wishes to endorse the view given in yesterday's report by the USSR Defense Ministry press center.

He also said that today the FRG Embassy will be handed a memorandum in which the USSR Foreign Ministry will lodge a protest against the actions of the FRG authorities.

On Gandhi; DPRK Nuclear Verification

LD2305182391 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT
23 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Excerpts] Moscow May 23 TASS—Vice-President Gennadiy Yanayev will lead the Soviet delegation which is to leave for New Delhi where it will be present at the funeral of Rajiv Gandhi, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vitaliy Churkin told a briefing here today.

The delegation will also include Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev and member of the Soviet parliament's Committee for Foreign Affairs Valentin Falin, who also heads the International Department of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee. [passage omitted]

The Soviet Union believes that North Korea, as a signatory of the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, is directly obligated to promptly conclude a verification agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), placing all nuclear materials on its territory under guarantees of that international agency. Political demands put forth by North Korea referring to the U.S. nuclear presence on the Korean peninsula "are not directly relating to the non-proliferation treaty," the spokesman said. The Soviet Union believes that there is no impasse there: taking into account the specifics of the situation in Korea efforts can be made to find a compromise solution.

"In this context, the United States should proceed from the interests of strengthening the international nuclear weapons regime and take steps to meet the Korean side halfway in order to create a more favorable and constructive atmosphere for the signing of a verification agreement between North Korea and the IAEA," Churkin said. [passage omitted]

U.S.-USSR Afghan Contacts Reported

OW2405050191 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1800 GMT 23 May 91

[Article by "Dipomatic Panorama" correspondent Igor Porshnev: "U.S. and USSR Continue Afghanistan-Related Contacts"]

[Text] A spokesman for the USSR Foreign Ministry made a statement on Afghanistan at a briefing in Moscow on Thursday. The statement spells out the Soviet Union's stand on the UN plan for settling the conflict in Afghanistan. Moscow welcomes United Nations efforts to unblock "this unnaturally protracted conflict" on the basis of "a balance of interests."

The main emphasis is placed on the promotion of the intra-Afghan dialogue. At the same time, as DP's [Dipomatic Panorama] [correspondent] learned from a Soviet diplomat who asked not to be identified, the USSR and the United States have continued their Afghanistan-related contacts, paying special attention to the issue of "negative symmetry," a project under which the delivery of weapons to all conflicting groups in Afghanistan is to be simultaneously stopped. The diplomat said the problem was that "the Kabul government receives weaponry from the Soviet Union alone, whereas the 'irreconcilable' opposition receives it from several sources: The USA, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia. Our immediate task is to have all these sources stopped simultaneously."

Ignatenko on G-7 Meeting, Cuban Missiles

PM2205162991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by A. Pokrovskiy: "What Is Happening With the 'Seven'"]

[Text] At a routine briefing, Vitaliy Ignatenko, the USSR president's aide and leader of the press service, answered questions from Soviet and foreign journalists. Our report also includes answers to IZVESTIYA's questions.

On Important Contacts

[Question] There is a lot of talk now about the participation of USSR President M. Gorbachev in the conference of the "seven" in London. There is talk of the ideas of Doctor Yavlinskiy and his group...

[Ignatenko] In recent days there have been substantial items published on this score. Attention is drawn by the article in IZVESTIYA and G. Yavlinskiy's interview with Yegor Yakovlev in MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI. But these important works need more detail.

The idea of contacts with the "big seven" belonged to President Gorbachev and has been examined for many months. Certain steps have been taken in various channels, including diplomatic channels. In brief, it was not born "suddenly." It is not an improvisation. Before Grigoriy Yavlinskiy's trip to the conference of experts he had a detailed conversation with Academician Primakov who briefed him on the whole picture. Then a letter appeared signed by Ye. Primakov and G. Yavlinskiy.

[Question] Can all this be called "the Gorbachev plan?"

[Ignatenko] I would call it a continuation of President Gorbachev's initiative. But I think that this action was

thought over and found support among representatives of the republics. Incidentally, during President Gorbachev's recent telephone conversation with President Bush, mutual interest was voiced in visits being paid both to the Soviet Union and the United States by representatives of sufficiently high rank who would be able to analyze the situation on the spot, exchange opinions with their colleagues, and reach particular conclusions on subsequent economic cooperation. At the end of this month Security Council member Ye. Primakov and First Deputy Prime Minister V. Shcherbakov will go to the United States for this purpose. There is the certainty that for two days they will have contacts with the chairman of the U.S. President's Council of Economic Advisers.

[Question] Is Ye. Primakov expected to meet with President Bush?

[Ignatenko] A meeting is desirable. At the same time I want to add that a meeting is proposed between President Gorbachev and a group of U.S. figures in the field of economics and agriculture which is already in the Soviet Union.

[Question] Does this have a bearing on the conference of the "seven?"

[Ignatenko] I think it has. It is known that the problem is being worked out at expert level. It is a case of coordinating positions, which will make it possible to link the programs for the stabilization of the economy and advance toward a mixed economy in the Soviet Union with the economic aid which is being implemented not only unilaterally but also bilaterally with the Western countries.

[Question] Will M. Gorbachev himself go to the session of the "seven?"

[Ignatenko] I can say confidently that he will accept an invitation from the West.

[Question] Will G.A. Yavlinskiy take part in this whole business?

[Ignatenko] Yavlinskiy, with his group, is already in the United States. He is holding contacts there with U.S. experts on conceptual questions of our collaboration. And he will obviously join in the talks which Ye. Primakov and V. Shcherbakov will have in the United States.

About the Missiles in Cuba

[Question] The U.S. press has published a report whose thrust is that Soviet SS-20 missiles have been detected in Cuba. What can you say?

[Ignatenko] That is a fabrication from beginning to end. I know that this report has already been officially denied in Washington. It is true that we have a missile in Cuba... but it is in a museum. A nonoperational SS-4 Soviet missile is kept in Havana as an exhibit. The treaty on

intermediate and shorter-range missiles authorizes the use of such missiles as static exhibits provided there is prior notification. The Soviet Union has fulfilled those terms.

On UN Troops in the USSR

[Question] E. Shevardnadze has mentioned the possibility of the use of UN troops on USSR territory in certain conditions...

[Ignatenko] That is the personal opinion of Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze. It does not reflect the position of the Soviet leadership, which does not think that.

[Question] THE WASHINGTON POST has published an article saying that during the Persian Gulf crisis the Soviet Union played a "dual game." It is claimed that Soviet military men took part in combat operations and that there were arms deliveries...

[Ignatenko] The reports published in THE WASHINGTON POST do not accord with reality. Not only did no Soviet military specialists take part in combat operations on the Iraqi Army's side, but they were not in the Persian Gulf zone during the war. There were no secret deliveries of arms or military equipment after the introduction of the relevant UN Security Council sanctions. The reference to the CIA in this report puts us on our guard: At any rate I would not like to link this reference with the appointment of the new CIA director.

Moscow Conference on G-7, Economy Reported

PM2305122191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
22 May 91 Union Edition p 3

[A. Stepovoy article: "Do Business! Notes From the Harvard University Conference Devoted to Moscow's Transition to Economic and Political Democracy"]

[Excerpts] As IZVESTIYA has already reported, a special conference for representatives of Moscow City Soviet, Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee, and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and Union governments has been held in Moscow within the framework of Harvard University's "Strengthening Democratic Institutions" project. In many ways this project is unusual not just for the Soviet participants but also for the "forge" of Western intellectuals, which is what Harvard is deservedly considered to be. For the first time a program has been implemented that is designed exclusively for foreign participants. It is the first time that such a conference has been held outside the confines of the United States. All previous sessions were organized at Harvard, and only occasionally were extremely high-ranking foreigners invited to them, for example members of parliament from Britain and other leading countries. And now almost the entire flower of Harvard has come to visit us (the participants were named in issue 115 of IZVESTIYA). [passage omitted]

A "Marshall Plan" for the USSR?

During the conference's work, two participants—Graham Allison and Grigoriy Yavlinskiy—were at the center of Soviet and foreign press attention. The efforts made by these men in talks with representatives of the seven most highly developed Western economies about the granting of financial and technological assistance to the USSR in exchange for profound transformations in the Soviet economy have become well known to the public. Issue 119 of IZVESTIYA published an article by the Yavlinskiy group about the Soviet Union's return to the world economy. We now set out the viewpoint of G. Yavlinskiy's partner in this matter, G. Allison. This is what he told an IZVESTIYA correspondent:

"The working group headed by myself and Yavlinskiy, which includes Soviet and American experts, has been working for several months now. Our aim is to keep track of the interrelationship between the Soviet Union's move toward democracy and the market economy and the effect of Western aid on this process. Each government has its own viewpoint on this process, but I think that if we coordinate our efforts we will be able to work out some sort of system that will be common to both governments and will indeed have some effect on this process.

"You ask what was in the memorandum I sent to Yavlinskiy from Harvard on 9 May. In it I set out my blueprint of what the Soviet Union should do on the basis of its own interests in order to follow this path. And what the West could do on the basis of its own interests.

"One concept of this cooperation, of this Great Deal, is clear—to offer the USSR aid on a 'Marshall Plan' scale. If the Soviet Union does indeed decide to embark on the road to a real transition to real political pluralism and a systematic program of rapidly transferring to a market economy, then the West should grant an aid program on the 'Marshall Plan' scale.

"The Soviet side took the main step toward meeting Western demands in the 'Statement of the Ten' with regard to power-sharing. What else does the West require? Two things, essentially.

"First: In line with the 'Statement of the Ten' and the USSR's commitments taken earlier in accordance with

the CSCE Treaty, the Soviet Government should at all levels reaffirm its international commitments to respect the rights of the individual in the USSR regardless of nationality, ethnic background, or religious affiliation.

"Second: The collective duty of the states in the Union is to concentrate their efforts on the next stage of development—the rapid (within the next three years) transition to a market economy, which is the most important foundation for maintaining democracy. The experts designated by the Ten must put together a realistic program for moving rapidly toward a free market economy with substantial Western aid and cooperation.

"According to my calculations, the financial provision for this project is completely realistic. Subsidies on the order of \$15 to 20 billion a year for several years are needed for this process. And if Japan, West Europe, and the United States share this expenditure, it will not be so burdensome for them and will be fully cost-recoverable because it really is a very important process.

"But from the political viewpoint this is a fairly complex matter despite the fact that it is in the West's interests; we still have to convince everyone of the need for the step. In order to convince the West that it is in its interests, Prof. Robert Blackwell and I have written an article entitled 'American Stakes in the Soviet Future' for the July issue of FOREIGN AFFAIRS magazine.

"How realistic are the chances of a Soviet delegation participating at the 'Big Seven' meeting in London? I think it is possible. From my point of view there is nothing bizarre about this. If President Gorbachev really intends to carry out rapid and effective economic reform in return for Western aid, then it would not be surprising if Bush meets with a Soviet delegation or Gorbachev in London. It would be a completely natural and necessary step.

"The most important thing at the moment is to draw up a joint plan which would work in such a way as to enable the countries' leaders to make a decision about the need for such actions. As in everything which concerns the project we are implementing, it would be appropriate at this point to repeat the motto: 'DO BUSINESS.'"

Prof. Allison pronounced the words of the motto in Russian...

United States & Canada

Further Reportage on Moiseyev Visit, Arms Talks

Meets Bush, Baker, Cheney

PM2305105591 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 23 May 91 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Meeting Held"]

[Text] Washington, 22 May—On Tuesday in the White House, U.S. President George Bush received Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of general staff of the USSR Armed Forces and USSR first deputy defense minister, who is heading a Soviet delegation at the talks taking place here with the U.S. side on questions of arms control.

During the talk, in which B. Scowcroft, the president's national security adviser, also took part, paramount attention was paid to a discussion of a wide range of arms control issues in the context of the entire agenda of Soviet-U.S. relations.

On the same day, the Soviet delegation continued talks with the U.S. side headed by Reginald Bartholomew, U.S. under secretary of state for international security affairs. USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Yu.A. Kvitsinskiy is taking part in the talks.

During the day, Army General M.A. Moiseyev met with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney, General Colin Powell, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other representatives of the U.S. Administration.

On Tuesday evening, a reception was held at the USSR Embassy to the United States in honor of the stay in Washington of the Soviet delegation headed by Army General M.A. Moiseyev. On the U.S. side it was attended by high-ranking representatives of the State Department and Defense Department and the U.S. public and business circles, including R. Bartholomew, General C. Powell, General M. McPeak, chief of staff of the U.S. Air Force, and other officials.

Talks 'Difficult But Useful'

LD2305195191 Moscow TASS in English 1942 GMT
23 May 91

[by TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—"The talks were difficult, but useful. I believe that good prospects are opening up in many directions," head of the Soviet Armed Forces General Staff General Mikhail Moiseyev told TASS. Moiseyev was speaking today immediately after ending his visit to the United States.

According to Moiseyev, he aimed to discuss with the U.S. side a number of arms reduction and limitation issues.

"We considered the settlement of the complex situation around the agreement on Conventional Forces in Europe, signed by the heads of 20 European states, the United States and Canada in Paris on November 19, 1990, as the main task of the visit," Moiseyev said.

He said the sides were expected to discuss the situation at Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons and other directions of the disarmament process.

During the visit, the sides approached the final settlement of disputable problems, Moiseyev said. He believes that "all obstacles on the road towards ratifying the agreement on Conventional Forces in Europe will soon be removed".

"But reciprocal efforts are needed," he said. "On our part, guided by interests of further positive development of international processes corresponding to aspirations of all peoples and countries, we have done the maximum possible," Moiseyev said.

The Soviet delegation in Washington was ready to hold full-scale discussions of all other problems of the disarmament process and had wide powers, Moiseyev said. "Unfortunately, despite the preliminary agreement, the U.S. side was not ready for such discussions," Moiseyev said.

CFE Negotiations, Visit Viewed

OW2405050391 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1800 GMT 23 May 91

[Article by "Diplomatic Panorama" correspondent Petr Vasilyev: "Conventional Arms Treaty: No More Differences Left?"—INTERFAX headline]

[Text] Talks concluded in Washington on Wednesday which President Gorbachev's special envoy General M. Moiseyev conducted with a view to eliminating the Soviet-American differences on the treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe [CFE]. According to the Soviet general, "the Americans displayed understanding" during the talks.

Mr. Moiseyev said that although the Soviet proposals were accepted caused a most positive reaction from the U.S. side, "arms control talks are not yet over. [sentence as received] The negotiating parties pledged to look for mutually acceptable solutions and promote constructive dialogue on the entire range of issues, including strategic offensive arsenals, chemical weapons, etc."

As DP's [Diplomatic Panorama] reporter has learned at the USSR Foreign Ministry, practically all differences over the content of the treaty were removed.

According to DP's own sources, of the three disputable provisions two were settled, notably the tank transfer across the Ural Mountains and the re-subordination of three motorised infantry divisions to the coastal guard command. The marines problem is still there. Genral

Moiseyev's suggestion was that the Soviet marines be left outside the framework of the talks, since under the cuts provided for by the treaty the marine corps would cease existing as an armed force (after all cuts were made, the Soviet marines would number 14,000 against America's 200,000-strong marine force.)

A Soviet diplomat who asked not to be identified described the remaining differences as "purely political." He suggested that the recent deadlock had resulted from a situation whereby each side was determined to defend its "rightness" to the end and unwilling to look for compromise solutions that would allegedly "weaken its positions." At the same time, each expected the other side to make unilateral concessions. The diplomat said both Moscow and Washington should now do everything to find mutually acceptable options and a political formula that would make it possible to finally untangle the "Gordian Knot" of the CFE treaty.

According to the Foreign Ministry official, the Soviet-American differences on the CFE treaty could have been eliminated "in a much simpler way", although he declined to say whether or not he is blaming the top Soviet military for the persistent difficulties. At the same time, the diplomat clearly indicated that the "deadlock in negotiations can be blamed on both sides, although the arguments of each of the two are quite understandable too." He expressed the hope that all of the remaining differences on the conventional force treaty would be removed in the near future, which would be vitally important to both the USSR and the USA.

Army Paper on Talks

PM2405104791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 24 May 91 First Edition p 3

[Report by unnamed TASS correspondent: "Talks End"]

[Excerpts] Washington, 22 May—The Soviet-U.S. talks on arms control issues ended here Wednesday. [passage omitted]

As Army General M.A. Moiseyev noted in conversation with your TASS correspondent at the end of the talks, the Soviet delegation met with definite understanding from the U.S. side. The Soviet proposals in this sphere produced a most positive response; however, the talks on arms control issues do not end here. Both sides have assumed commitments to seek a solution and take reciprocal steps in keeping with the spirit and interests of cooperation between our countries and to continue constructive dialogue on the whole range of talks under way, including those on strategic, offensive, chemical, and other arms.

Paper Views Prospects for Gates' CIA Nomination

PM2305154391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 21 May 91 Second Edition p 3

[Article by M. Ivanov: "Gates and 'Irangate': Will the 'Passage of Time' Help the Nominee for CIA Director?"]

[Text] CIA staffers learned a piece of news the other day which would clearly gladden any professional's heart. President Bush has decided to nominate 47-year-old Robert Gates, currently first deputy assistant to the President for national security affairs, for the post of CIA director. For the first time, a career intelligence officer with 20 years' experience could be at the helm of one of the U.S. intelligence community's chief departments.

As U.S. media commentaries observe, in choosing Gates Bush "clearly preferred a career intelligence officer over a political appointee." It is the U.S. President's plan that Gates devote himself solely to intelligence gathering and leave politics aside. Like his predecessor, William Webster, who retired last week, the new CIA chief will not be a member of the cabinet and will accordingly take no direct part in political decisionmaking.

According to Bush, he himself preached such an approach to intelligence work when he was CIA director. In appointing Gates, Bush appears to be taking into account above all the experience of his predecessor, Ronald Reagan, under whom CIA Director William Casey played an active role in shaping the U.S. Administration's political course. Casey's close link with Ronald Reagan almost misfired on the President during the "Irangate" scandal when, despite the existing legislative ban, money earned from the secret sale of U.S. weapons to Iran was transferred to the Nicaraguan Contras. This scandal cost the jobs of many figures in the then administration, and Reagan himself only saved his skin with some difficulty.

The role of the U.S. special services in this affair is well known. That is precisely why Gates' first attempt to obtain the CIA director's post in 1987 ended in failure. Faced with the hearings in the Senate, where his appointment was to be ratified, Gates himself preferred not to tempt fate and withdrew his nomination, fearing the meticulous cross-examination of the U.S. senators.

However, four years have passed since then, and President Bush is calculating that the "passage of time" will play its role and the senators will display greater tolerance toward the candidate. The prestige that Gates won during the Persian Gulf crisis—when, together with his chief Brent Scowcroft and Defense Secretary Richard Cheney, he was part of the special group that made all the decisions on the Gulf—could be a major trump card in the President's hands. Now, as observers are noting, Gates may lose this influence, a fact which, nevertheless, does not faze the candidate himself, who—according to one administration official—"is receiving the post he has dreamed of all his life." In announcing his decision, Bush made it clear that "Irangate" is history and that he has complete faith in Gates.

And although at the moment none of the legislators have made any accusations against the candidate, his confirmation in the Senate, to use the figurative expression of the U.S. press, is not promising to be an "easy ride." A number of senators have already stated that the question

of the "Iran-Contra" affair would be raised again at the hearings, and questions may also be asked about the role of Bush himself, who was vice president at that time. Ohio Democrat Howard Metzenbaum openly expressed his disappointment with Bush's choice. Democrat Bill Bradley also reacted to this decision with restraint: According to him, he intends to ask "important questions about Gates' past, his approaches to leadership of the U.S. intelligence community, and his role in the protection of American interests."

And yet the majority of senators have greeted positively the news of Gates' nomination. Furthermore, the president has time to enlist support for his nominee: The hearings on Gates' candidacy will probably not start until June, and the vote in the Senate will not take place before August-September.

As for Gates' position vis-a-vis the USSR, here he is closer to the conservatives. "Gates believes," THE WASHINGTON POST writes on this score, "that the Soviet leader is making sincere efforts, but he believes that authoritarianism will be needed in the country to maintain the current policy, and it will take 50, 60, or 70 years to implement." Incidentally, it was the conservatism of the candidate for the post of CIA director that served as the basis for his conflict with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker in 1989, when at the insistence of the head of the U.S. foreign policy department a Gates report which assessed in very pessimistic tones the prospects for the implementation of the reforms proclaimed by the Soviet leadership was "deep-sixed."

Bush Cited on 'Support' for Gorbachev, Summit

*PM2305151191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
22 May 91 First Edition p 1*

[TASS report: "Desire To Help Remains"]

[Text] Washington, 21 May—"I want to hold a summit meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev," President Bush stated on Monday. He pointed out that the USSR and the United States are "on the way to resolving questions connected with the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe and the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Arms."

The U.S. President was appearing with German Chancellor Kohl at a White House press conference on the results of the bilateral talks held here.

"We held detailed discussions about the Soviet Union," Bush reported. "The chancellor shared my views on this important question... I think that I express our mutual opinion if I say that we want to be in a position to help the USSR by every possible means. We both express confidence in President Gorbachev. I would like to take this opportunity to stress full agreement in our support of Gorbachev."

House Endorses Military Appropriations Bill

*PM2305101991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 22 May 91 First Edition p 5*

[TASS report: "What Is the Cost of SDI?"]

[Text] The U.S. House of Representatives has decided to accept the recommendation of its Armed Services Committee to reduce the appropriations requested by the Bush administration for the basic SDI program from \$4.6 billion to \$2.7 billion. This became known Monday, when congressmen commenced their examination of the bill on military appropriations for fiscal 1992.

An amendment whereby only \$1.1 billion would be allocated for SDI was also put to a vote. The proposal was voted down by 266 votes to 118, leaving the Armed Services Committee recommendation in force.

It also envisages that as well as appropriations of \$2.7 billion to create a wide-ranging missile defense system with space-based components, over \$800 million will be allocated for work on a global system for defense against limited strikes—a new component of the "Strategic Defense Initiative."

The legislators have yet to discuss other provisions of the document approved by the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee, which, according to its chairman, Democrat Les Aspin, "more than any other bill of recent years is the result of lessons taught in the real world." In particular, the committee proposed abandoning the construction in the next fiscal year of four new B-2 strategic bombers using "stealth" technology, for which the administration was asking \$3.2 billion. The committee members proposed limiting the number to 15, as envisaged by plans already approved. At the same time it is proposed that \$1.6 billion be allocated for research on the B-2 construction program. It is also planned to increase appropriations for conventional armaments—M-1 tanks, F-15 and F-16 aircraft, and the Patriot missile defense systems which performed well during the war with Iraq.

U.S. President George Bush has threatened to veto the military appropriations bill if it is approved by the House of Representatives in the form recommended by the committee.

The President accused legislators of seeking to secure finance for armaments produced in their states.

Riga Reception Marks U.S. Consul's Departure

*OW2405021591 Moscow BALTFAX in English
0930 GMT 23 May 91*

[Text] A reception was held on Wednesday night at the house of the Latvian Writers' Union in Riga in honor of the U.S. Consul General in Leningrad Richard Miles who is making a farewell tour of the Baltic republics at the end of his three year term in the USSR. On Tuesday

he visited Vilnius where he met the chairman of the Lithuanian parliament Vytautas Landsbergis.

Speaking at the reception in Riga Mr. Miles said he would make his contribution to the accurate understanding of the Baltic question in U.S. leading circles. He recalled that as consul in Leningrad he visited Latvia more than ten times.

In a speech of reply the chairman of the Latvian parliament Anatoliy Gorbunovs thanked the American official for his great attention to the Baltic republics, especially in the past six months, stressing that thanks to the consul and his subordinates more U.S. congressmen and senators visited Latvia during the tragic developments last January than after May 4, 1990 when the Republic's parliament passed the declaration on the restoration of independence.

Richard Miles who is being transferred to Germany will be replaced by Jack Gosnale, earlier a science secretary at the U.S. Embassy in Moscow.

China

Anti-West Rapprochement With PRC Urged

PM2405083591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 23 May 91 First Edition p 5

[Article under "Viewpoint" rubric by USSR People's Deputy Ed. Gams, cochairman of the Servicemen-Deputies' Club, and Yu. Selivanov: "Eastern Alternative"]

[Text] Now that our plans for a great economic leap forward have been left "on hold" in the face of the growing destabilization of the economy and with still harder times lying ahead, it is becoming obvious that the foundations of our new foreign policy course have essentially proved insufficiently sound. Of course, people in the West believe that the Soviet Union can be welcomed even now into the bosom of world or, rather, Western civilization—but not, to be sure, with the rank of a great power but merely as a raw materials appendage and a source of cheap manpower. And there seems to be a distinct tendency to welcome it piecemeal, for this is more convenient for many of our Western partners—for it is simpler and safer to deal with individual "sovereign principalities" than with the huge yet ailing Soviet Union. These Western circles do not envisage a place on the future map of the world for the mighty socialist Soviet state.

These circles' representatives ought to remember that our state's unity is certainly not based on the evil will of the "imperial center" but on the historical interlacing of its peoples' destinies, which should be perceived as an immutable reality and be taken into account in any transformations of state structures. To ignore this age-old order of things would be to risk the most disastrous consequences, and those politicians who think that this

can be disregarded doom the country to a catastrophic future. There is and can be no doubt about this.

So, there is an obvious contradiction here. On the one hand, the unconditional need to preserve the Soviet Union's state unity (with all expedient internal transformations) and, on the other, the general line of our foreign policy founded on partnership—chiefly with the West and, above all, with the United States, which is working increasingly purposefully to weaken the USSR and even to dismember it and makes the continuation of this partnership conditional on this.

It is perfectly clear that we cannot accept the ultimatum-like terms which some people in the West dictate to us today. And this means that we must abandon our hopes of further rapprochement with it in the majority of spheres of vital importance to us. The substance of the new thinking in foreign policy, with its chief gamble precisely on the Western partnership, is, accordingly, also being partly transformed.

What awaits us in this case? Complete international isolation? The cessation of all ties with the outside world? Another break with world civilization? We consider this viewpoint a delusion. The Soviet Union has a foreign policy alternative—one which will not require its self-destruction as payment for "a place in international affairs." The name of this alternative is China. Rather, a new Soviet-Chinese rapprochement. It is simply amazing how we, bewitched by the mellifluousness of the "sirens" of Western democracy, contrived to almost lose sight of our great eastern neighbor, who has a political and economic system similar to ours, an almost identical scientific and technical level, kindred (in the literal sense) technology, and colossal human and material resources!

We will dare to claim that very favorable conditions have now taken shape for a new rapprochement between Moscow and Beijing. Above all because our two countries are encountering similar problems in relations with the outside world. After the West's hopes for the "democratization" of China were not realized, there was a cooling toward cooperation with it—which at once led to a decisive curtailment of relations in the majority of spheres.

It is true that attempts to exert economic pressure on the PRC did not produce the desired results, and the West has now practically restored the previous very high level of trade with that country.

A similar approach to the Soviet Union can already be perceived today, since it too is not justifying the hopes of the most orthodox Western politicians in its imminent collapse. And they will evidently try to isolate us, like they did China. Yes, this process has probably begun already. Are these not grounds for rapprochement between Moscow and Beijing? The top-level talks held two years ago during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to China, and the visit which Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, has just completed to the

USSR, have had a beneficial effect on Soviet-Chinese relations. The latter's visit was an important step toward further improving relations between our countries—which in turn will also have a very positive impact on military detente throughout the Asia-Pacific region. The Soviet-Chinese joint communique speaks of readiness to further develop friendly, good-neighborly, mutually advantageous cooperation. The 16 May signing of the agreement on the eastern sector of the Soviet-Chinese border by the USSR and PRC foreign ministers may also be considered a major success.

As Jiang Zemin said at the 15 May Kremlin reception, China and the Soviet Union have tremendous potential and extensive prospects for more profound contacts and cooperation in all spheres. And the normal development of Soviet-Chinese relations accords with the aspirations of both countries' peoples.

The potential for possible cooperation between the USSR and China is truly inexhaustible. Despite our technological lag behind world standards, China is very interested in modernizing the basis of its economy precisely with the USSR's assistance; because it needs to consistently renew its economy, and this is possible only by borrowing kindred technology.

Particularly topical for the Chinese is the question of the technical modernization of their Armed Forces, in which the West has resolutely refused to help them. The Soviet Union is a natural alternative for China on this plane, particularly as there is long-standing experience of such cooperation. The Chinese have already begun studying the Soviet arms market in earnest and, to all appearances, are ready to go quite far in this respect.

Of course, after all that has happened in our relations with that country, the very possibility of a new Soviet-Chinese rapprochement will strike some people as utopian. They still recall the recent acute confrontation between our countries, which almost led to a great calamity. But must we absolutize the past? It should be remembered that the confrontation at that time was a product of specific historical conditions which today have changed very, very much.

The USSR and China quarreled while at the zenith of their might, when it seemed to their rulers that the victory of socialism on a world scale had already been predetermined and all that remained was to share the laurels. Soviet-Chinese rivalry for the leadership of the socialist world became possible under conditions when it seemed to Moscow and Beijing that there was no longer any force on the planet capable of withstanding them. "Decrepit imperialism" was not taken into account. It was not for nothing that the peak of the confrontation between our countries came precisely during the seventies—the time of "socialism's global offensive over the whole front."

Times have changed. "Decaying capitalism" has switched to a strategic counteroffensive. And today it is

a question of the two countries' destiny and the competence of their state and economic systems. Today they are on the defensive, and at present they basically separately oppose virtually one and the same adversary. Is this not a basis for all-around cooperation?

We believe that the path of cooperation with China in all respects is preferable for us to rapprochement with the West on crushing terms. This version of international partnership certainly does not threaten us with the fate of a raw materials appendage to someone else's industrial machine. Rather, we will find ourselves in the position of a partner of equal worth with respect to China. No, of course cooperation with the PRC will not bring us up to the technological level of Japan or the United States. But it must not be forgotten that we can hardly count on technological equalization with those powers even by forming a bloc with them, if only because they are not in the least interested in this, and our laggardness is very considerable.

A new Soviet-Chinese rapprochement could have healthy influence on the sociopolitical processes taking place in our country and will help us, at last, to extricate ourselves from a period of chaotic turmoil and to enter a stage of real economic stabilization. And it should be remembered that the weighty interests of both powers are concentrated in the Asia-Pacific region, while everyone recognizes that the center of development of the world economy and human civilization will soon shift precisely to that Asia-Pacific region.

The consequences of such rapprochement in the military-political sphere could be of fundamental importance. Strategic cooperation between two of the planet's greatest powers could radically alter a military balance which has shaped up in an unfavorable way for them today and create conditions for the initiation of really equitable and all-embracing talks on military detente and arms reduction. What is more, equitable economic, military-political, and cultural interaction and cooperation between our two countries could have a very favorable influence on the course of all world affairs and restore a global equilibrium of forces which is on the verge of collapse and is vitally necessary for all peoples of the planet.

Life has shown that there are still forces in the world today which are prepared to utilize any opportunity to implement their global expansion. And the more the correlation of forces changes in their favor, the greater will be the scale of this expansion. The evolution of the United States is significant in this respect. Having begun the decade of the eighties by seizing tiny Grenada and then swallowing a somewhat richer tidbit—Panama—today it is already "licking its lips" over the entire Persian Gulf. And there are no guarantees that tomorrow, if the situation in the world is equally favorable for the United States, the U.S. Armed Forces will not be set new and still more far-reaching tasks. Only the restoration of a stable balance of power can give the world's peoples such guarantees.

In light of all this, a substantial change in the priorities of Soviet foreign policy appears perfectly inevitable. Its present, primarily Western orientation, which is today demonstrating its defective nature, can be successfully replaced by a qualitatively different, eastern orientation, opening up new and practically unlimited prospects before us.

Chinese Patrol Boat Strays in Amur River

91P50186A Moscow TRUD in Russian 18 May 91 p 4

[Article by I. Krasikov; "A Patrol Boat Went Astray"]

[Text] On a rainy night from 15 to 16 May, border guards of one of the posts of the Far East Border District intercepted a Chinese patrol boat which had slipped into one of the Amur channels of our side.

An interception at gunpoint took place immediately. Our own patrol boards and seamen-border guards were dispatched to the channel. Withdrawal routes for the "adjacent" patrol boat were safely cut off. But it turned out that the neighbors' military craft was in need of help. Having run aground, it was firmly stuck not far from shore. Moreover, there was a wounded man on board who had been unconscious for some time.

The Soviet border guards heaved the Chinese navy men off the shoal and after examining the boat, were convinced that the neighbors simply had gotten lost in the bad weather; they returned the boat to the Chinese shore. The wounded man, who needed first aid, was taken to our shore and operated on in the Khabarovsk Military Hospital.

Ivashko Receives Friendship Delegation Head

PM2305135991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 May 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meeting at the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received 22 May the PRC public figure Yue Feng, who is leading a delegation to the USSR from the Chinese People's Association for Friendship With Foreign Countries at the invitation of the Moscow Cultural Foundation.

Noting the great importance of the recent talks in Moscow between the top leaders of the USSR and the PRC, V.A. Ivashko expressed confidence that the Soviet-Chinese summit will provide a powerful boost to the development of friendship and cooperation between our peoples. The participants in the talks advocated the extensive utilization of new opportunities to expand mutually useful creative, cultural, and scientific ties between the USSR and the PRC.

Present at the talks were A.Ya. Stepanova and V.G. Sergeyev, deputy chairmen of the Moscow Cultural Foundation Board; and Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR.

Near East & South Asia

Yanayev Heads Delegation to Gandhi Funeral

LD2305132291 Moscow TASS in English 1209 GMT
23 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—A Soviet delegation led by Vice-President Gennadiy Yanayev flew from Moscow to New Delhi today to attend the funeral service for the late former Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vitaliy Churkin said.

He told a briefing here that the delegation includes Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev and Valentin Falin, chief of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee's International Department and a member of the parliamentary Committee for Foreign Relations.

Delegation Arrives

LD2305163991 Moscow TASS in English 1619 GMT
23 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Karmalito]

[Text] New Delhi May 23 TASS—A Soviet delegation led by Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev arrived here today to attend the funeral service for the late Indian statesman and politician Rajiv Gandhi.

The delegation includes Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev and Valentin Falin, chief of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee's International Department and a member of the parliamentary Committee for Foreign Relations.

Yanayev Visits Gandhi's Widow

LD2305220791 Moscow TASS in English 2104 GMT
23 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Karmalito]

[Text] New Delhi May 23 TASS—A Soviet delegation led by Soviet Vice-President Gennadiy Yanayev today arrived in the Indian capital to take part in the funeral of prominent state and political figure Rajiv Gandhi.

From the airport, Yanayev immediately headed for the residence of the Gandhi family.

"On behalf of Mikhail and Raisa Gorbachev," Yanayev expressed deep condolences to Sonia Gandhi and her children.

Yanayev wished the widow strength of spirit and will in overcoming the hard ordeal. He noted that all Rajiv Gandhi's friends in the Soviet Union share the family's grief.

CPSU CC Secretariat Condolences on Ghandi

*PM2305154991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 May 91 Second Edition p 1*

[Message of condolences from CPSU Central Committee Secretariat on Rajiv Gandhi's assassination to the INC-I Working Committee, under the general heading "India's Grief and Pain: Following Rajiv Gandhi's Assassination"]

[Text] To the Indian National Congress-Indira [INC-I] Party Working Committee:

We express our profound condolences in connection with the tragic death of Rajiv Gandhi, outstanding Indian politician and statesman and acknowledged leader of the INC-I. Rajiv Gandhi will go down in history as a man who fought for peace and cooperation between peoples, a man who favored resolving problems by peaceful nonviolent means. He made a major contribution to the friendship between the Soviet and Indian peoples and to the strengthening of ties between our parties.

We ask you to convey our sincere feelings of grief to R. Gandhi's family.

[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat.

CPSU Expresses Condolences at Indian Embassy

*LD2405031491 Moscow TASS in English 1055 GMT
23 May 91*

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—Soviet Communist Party delegation led by deputy Communist Party leader Vladimir Ivashko and consisting of Central Committee Secretaries Aleksandr Dzasokhov and Valentin Falin today visited the Indian Embassy in connection with Rajiv Gandhi's death.

The CPSU representatives honoured his memory with a minute of silence and wrote their condolences in the book of condolences.

Manayenkov Leads CPSU Group to Afghanistan

Meets Party Aktiv

*PM1705100391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 May 91 Second Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "CPSU Delegation in Afghanistan"]

[Text] Kabul, 16 May—The CPSU delegation which is in Afghanistan had a meeting with Kabul's party aktiv at the Soviet Science and Culture Center.

On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, Yu.A. Manayenkov, head of the delegation and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, greeted the activists from the capital's Fatherland Party organization, noting that in the past few years the Fatherland Party has been enriched by considerable experience of political and organizational work among the masses and has grown stronger both ideologically and organizationally. The goals of the party program and statutes are most fully in line with the Afghan people's interests. Yu.A. Manayenkov talked in detail about the situation in the Soviet Union and the CPSU, particularly stressing that perestroika has become a historic necessity, even though not everything has turned out the way it was planned in 1985. We are on the right track, he stated.

The delegation visited the Fatherland Party Central Council's Social Science Institute and held a "round-table" meeting with representatives of Afghanistan's 10 political parties and organizations. During the talks there was an earnest exchange of opinions on questions of bilateral relations and international problems.

Manayenkov Speaks to Press

*LD1905153591 Moscow TASS in English 1507 GMT
19 May 91*

[By TASS correspondent German Baykov]

[Text] Kabul May 19 TASS—A Soviet Communist Party delegation led by secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Y. A. Manayenkov, on an official visit here at the invitation of the Fatherland Party, met Afghan journalists.

Replying to questions, Manayenkov stressed that the Soviet Union and Afghanistan are bound by the bonds of long-standing friendship. "We see how the Afghan people are interested in this friendship, and I'd like to stress that the USSR has been and will be a reliable friend of Afghanistan," he noted.

The Soviet political and state leaders are convinced that the Afghan question can be resolved only politically. They are making great diplomatic efforts to stop interference in Afghanistan's domestic affairs.

The Afghan people are wise people, and they will resolve their problems on their own, Manayenkov noted. He expressed confidence that peace would come to this land, and Afghanistan would become a prosperous state.

Ends Visit, Departs

*LD2005094491 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0722 GMT 20 May 91*

[Text] Kabul, 20 May (TASS)—A CPSU delegation, headed by Y.A. Manayenkov, secretary of the CPSU, which was here on an official visit at the invitation of the Central Council of the Homeland Party within the framework of inter-party links, has left for home today.

The delegation was seen off at Kabul Airport by F.A. Mazdak and M. Mohammad, deputy chairmen of the Homeland Party, as well as by B.N. Pastukhov, the USSR ambassador to the Republic of Afghanistan.

Observer on Prospects for Afghan Settlement

LD2405032191 Moscow TASS in English 2023 GMT
23 May 91

[By TASS international observer Yuriy Tyssovski]

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—Recent reports from Kabul, Islamabad, Tehran, New York and other capitals involved to one or another degree in efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement of Afghan problems have given rise to a fair share of optimistic forecasts. Optimism was given a further boost last Tuesday when UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar made a statement on the fundamentals of the political settlement in Afghanistan which, he stressed, is acceptable for the overwhelming majority of the Afghan people.

A closer look at the statement reveals convincing proofs of this. Without the approval of Perez De Cuellar's peace plan by different sides to the protracted conflict in and around Afghanistan it would hardly have been published.

The secretary general's personal envoy Ben Sevan made several shuttle trips in the region during the last month seeking to coordinate all aspects of the reached agreement. He has been to Peshawar for talks with the interim Afghan Islamic Government and its field commanders. On the whole, Sevan praised the results of his contacts, although it may be naive to think that all rebel groups are ready to sign the proposals made on behalf of the world community.

Kabul welcomed the UN proposals in their entirety, Radio Kabul said on Wednesday, just as expected because the UN secretary general's peace plan included many proposals advanced by President Najibullah earlier. They were incorporated into Perez De Cuellar's proposals not in order to flatter the Afghan leadership but because they were reasonable, flexible and consistent with the requirements of the situation in Afghanistan. Their key provisions call for a prompt beginning of the intra-Afghan dialogue with the aim to hold free elections and form a national government capable of taking the country out of the blind alley of the civil war.

To the leaders of the most irreconcilable rebel groups in Peshawar, these calls are against the grain. On Wednesday, reports arrived from Peshawar that the interim government's Information Minister Najibullah Lafrey categorically turned down the very idea of a dialogue with the Kabul communists. The spokesman for the opposition parties in Peshawar, Minhadj, was adamant in his statement that "the only solution is to continue the war."

The rebels continue to count on the military force and the support by Pakistan. The leadership of that country, while paying lip service to a peaceful solution, pins all hopes for the overthrow of the Kabul government on the most extremist of the Peshawar leaders.

Hostilities are now raging outside Gardiz, in some regions in north Afghanistan and near Qandahar. In other words, there is little doubt left that the scale of bloodshed will expand. The UN secretary general's initiative offers a truly golden chance to avoid this dramatic turn of events. In his statement Perez de Cuellar calls on all Afghan leaders to place the interests of the Afghan people above all others and settle the present differences by political means, putting an end to the long devastating war. May all whom it concerns heed this call.

Petrovskiy Meets Afghan UN Representative

PM1705101591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 May 91 Union Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, received K. Basharmal, Afghan permanent representative to the United Nations, at his request 15 May.

There was a thorough discussion on questions connected with the achievement of a settlement of the Afghan problem and the UN role in resolving this regional conflict.

East Europe

Further on Hungarian Foreign Minister Visit

Bessmertnykh Comments on Talks

LD2305123591 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1137 GMT 23 May 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Ryabikin and Nikolay Veretin]

[Text] Moscow, 23 May—Relations with Eastern European countries, including Hungary, are a top priority in the Soviet Union's foreign policy, USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh stated today after the conclusion of talks with Hungarian Foreign Minister Geza Jeszenskzy.

According to the minister, the USSR and Hungary are now embarking upon a new phase, distinguished by recognition of complete independence, sovereignty, and free choice regarding the direction of policy.

As Bessmertnykh noted, Soviet-Hungarian relations, along with the USSR's relations with other countries in the region, are now acquiring a firm basis for development. They have "a wide range of possibilities, and they just need to be activated". In his opinion, an objective

foundation exists for this: traditions and a friendship that "has not been broken off as the result of the events of recent years, but has received a new lease on life." "Therefore," the head of the foreign policy department noted, "I take an optimistic view of the development of our ties with Hungary and other countries of the region."

The USSR and Hungary are now creating a new treaty-based and legal foundation for their relations, Bessmertnykh said. Work is in progress on a treaty that "is meant to embrace the main fields interesting the two countries." This treaty will also contain provisions intended to safeguard the two states' interests in the military-political sphere. Both sides are approaching this with an identical understanding of the need to work out wording that does not provoke any fears on the part of each other or of third countries. Work on this issue will continue and, the Soviet minister believes, the sides "will reach a mutually acceptable wording".

After the completion of the talks, the foreign ministers of the Soviet Union and Hungary signed a protocol on consultations between the USSR Foreign Ministry and the Hungarian Foreign Ministry.

MTI on Talks With Bessmertnykh

LD2305142791 Budapest MTI in English 1337 GMT
23 May 91

[Text] Moscow, May 23 (MTI)—This meeting today has opened a new chapter in the history of Hungarian-Soviet relations,' Hungarian Foreign Minister Geza Jeszenszky stated after his Thursday discussion with his Soviet counterpart, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, in Moscow. 'Both parties were of the view that the contacts should show a steadily improving tendency,' said the Hungarian foreign minister.

Geza Jeszenszky, who arrived in Moscow on a brief working visit on Wednesday, held a more than two-hour discussion with Aleksandr Bessmertnykh on the state of bilateral links, and then the two ministers signed the co-operation agreement. (The talks will be continued during the gala lunch to be given by the Soviet side, where the future meeting between the Hungarian prime minister and the Soviet head of state will be discussed in greater detail.)

In an interview with MTI's correspondent after the first ministerial meeting, Ambassador Sandor Gyorke said that the Hungarian-Soviet foreign ministerial meeting was explicitly promising with its far better than expected atmosphere.

After the signing ceremony, Bessmertnykh told Hungarian journalists that the Soviet side shared the Hungarian prime minister's view that the two countries needed not only a simple agreement, but also a good one. He also said that a high-ranking expert from the Hungarian delegation (probably David Meiszter) would stay in Moscow to participate in solving the open questions relating to the general agreement.

Speaking to journalists, Geza Jeszenszky pointed out that Soviet-Hungarian relations were characterized by continuous progress. He said that Hungary intends finishing the talks about the settlement of accounts related to Soviet troop withdrawals before the completion of the pull-out. With regard to economic co-operation, the Hungarian minister said that the problems stemming from a grave shortage of hard currency on both sides have to be overcome firstly through barter deals.

Ministers Brief Journalists

LD2305171991 Budapest Kossuth Radio Network
in Hungarian 1600 GMT 23 May 91

[Excerpts] Having finished his talks in Moscow, Foreign Minister Geza Jeszenszky flew directly to Rome. Before this he and his Soviet colleague Aleksandr Bessmertnykh made a statement to journalists about their talks today. Gabor Izbeki, our Moscow correspondent, reports on this news conference.

[Izbeki] [passage omitted] According to Geza Jeszenszky, following the grave problems at the beginning of the year, favorable changes can be expected in trade turnover.

[Begin Jeszenszky recording] Both parties understand what kinds of difficulties resulted from the switchover. We do not consider the basic principles mistaken; that is, accounting based on realistic prices and taking into consideration convertibility. At the same time we were not prepared for the fact that in practice, both countries have a very serious currency shortage. Therefore both parties came to the conclusion that certain currency saving measures and barter agreements must be found to enable us to move out of this deadlock situation.

Over the past weeks and days, very important decisions were made in the USSR, too. This is in connection with discussing the economic and competency questions between the Soviet central government and the member republics. Obstacles were also removed from beginning economic traffic, that is, deliveries between either the member states or companies themselves, in the shape of central agreements. Here, the most well known is the question of bus deliveries. However, I think this will create a precedence, and in the next few weeks those products held back so far can now flow each way. [end recording]

[Izbeki] Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, in reply to a question, said that following the change of regimes, relations between Eastern Europe and the USSR have not been pushed into the background.

[Begin Bessmertnykh recording in Russian, with superimposed Hungarian translation] Our relations with Eastern Europe, and therefore with Hungary too, occupy a special place in Soviet foreign policy. There was a, let me put it this way, a brief natural pause for thought, when everyone was able to take account of how they

wanted to cooperate and with whom. I think that we are beginning a new era in our relations which will be characterized by complete independence, acknowledging sovereignty and the free determination of political directions. I am certain that Hungarian-Soviet relations, just like our relations with the other countries of the region, will be put on more solid bases than existed until now. There is every opportunity for them to develop. Our task is to organize this, to imbue it with life. So although our relations have objective bases, they also have their traditions. In fact, the earlier friendship was not severed, it has only been revived. Therefore, I am very optimistic about the development of Hungarian-Soviet relations, and this goes for the future of our cooperation with the rest of the East European countries as well [end recording] [passage omitted]

Jeszzenszky Interviewed on Talks

LD2305/44791 Moscow Radio Moscow in Hungarian
2000 GMT 22 May 91

[Text] The working visit to the Soviet Union by Foreign Affairs Minister Geza Jeszenszky began today. Presumably, during the negotiations in Moscow the principal attention will be focused on Soviet-Hungarian political and economic relations, on the synchronization of certain paragraphs of the new treaty, and on the preparation of Jozsef Antall's official visit to Moscow. The Hungarian press has stressed that Jeszenszky's visit is taking place at a very complex moment. On the eve of the visit to Moscow the foreign minister gave an interview to Sergey Shevikin, our reporter in Budapest. Owing to technical disturbances Jeszenszky's statement will be read by an announcer.

[Shevikin] What possibilities have existed and exist now for the development of Soviet-Hungarian cooperation?

[Announcer] In 1945 excellent possibilities opened up for the construction of normal relations between the Soviet Union and Hungary, the Hungarian foreign minister said. Under the Yalta agreements free elections had to take place in Hungary. Unfortunately the Stalinist policy deprived the country of the possibility of free elections and simultaneously also of the possibility of becoming a true friend of the Soviet Union. Thus the opportunity was lost a long time ago. Now, this possibility appeared again only a few years ago, the minister stated, when Gorbachev's new foreign policy began to prevail. The changes since then in many Eastern European countries have not led to the worsening of the relations among these countries nor to the worsening of those between Hungary and the Soviet Union. On the contrary, they have led to establishing the conditions for the construction of close and friendly relations, based on new foundations.

The six legislative parties and the government agree that everything that was valuable in the cooperation of our countries must be maintained, while at the same time there should be not even the smallest departure from the principle of voluntariness and mutual advantage.

Jeszzenszky expressed his hope that the free desire for good-neighborliness will be fully reflected in the new Hungarian-Soviet treaty. There is still one uncoordinated point in the treaty that deals with the guaranteeing of mutual security. Hungary, the minister said, recognizes the Soviet Union's right to wish for a reliable neighbor on its western border and it is ready to undertake an obligation in accordance with the international legal norms contained in the Helsinki Final Accord and the Paris charter.

Today Hungary is seeking to create good relations not only with the Soviet Union as a united entity but also with the republics within its framework, the minister asserted. Traditionally close relations have evolved with the Ukraine, Estonia, Armenia, and other republics too. The country often has a material interest in direct relations with the republics, if, for example, there is a need to conclude agreement on oil deliveries.

The Hungarian minister of foreign affairs finally emphasized that the Hungarian-Soviet relationship has now begun to be healthier. He expressed the hope that the negotiations in Moscow will promote

Jeszzenszky Interviewed on Relations

LD2305/64991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 1430 GMT 23 May 91

[Interview with Hungarian Foreign Minister Geza Jeszenszky by Igor Ternyavskiy in Moscow on 23 May—recorded; Jeszenszky speaks in Hungarian with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Ternyavskiy] Good day! Hungary's Foreign Minister Geza Jeszenszky visited Moscow today. He met his Soviet colleague Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and discussed topical questions of bilateral relations. Then his news conference took place, after which I managed to have a brief, exclusive interview with Geza Jeszenszky. So, my first question was as follows:

Mr. Minister, quite recently the relations between Hungary and the Soviet Union were built on common ideological interests. But on what will relations between our countries be based in the nineties and in the future?

[Jeszzenszky] In my view, common class interests never existed. This is fiction. On the whole, the world has already been through this, and in international relations interests common to all mankind have moved to the forefront. There are conflicts, of course, but they are easily overcome. I attach great importance to the fact that in the future relations between our countries will be built on the basis of national interests.

[Ternyavskiy] Second question. On 30 June the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary is to be completed. How is this process proceeding? And what will replace Soviet military townlets in Hungary?

[Jeszzenszky] This process is proceeding according to schedule. Part of the facilities remain at present. Some of

them can easily be used, say, as hospitals. There are also facilities which we do not need. This consists of a large number of buildings which are, alas, in poor condition. On the whole, it is difficult to determine whether we will be able to put them in order. We must now dwell on figures: How much are these facilities worth? What is the damage to them? There is also a psychological element here.

[Ternyavskiy] And a third question. How do you see the future of Europe, the security of the ancient continent?

[Jeszenszky] I think that each country, for the time being, still needs a certain level of armaments. This applies to the Soviet Union too. But very important is the atmosphere of trust that has already come about thanks to the Vienna agreement on disarmament and also the Paris Charter. Our two countries need to continue further along this path, for which the CSCE is a good basis.

Churkin on Treaty Preparations

LD2305191291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 23 May 91

[Text] [Announcer Viktor Levin] Talks between USSR Foreign minister Bessmertnykh and Hungarian Foreign Minister Jeszenszky took place in Moscow today. The main topic of their talks is preparations for the new bilateral treaty. I asked Vitaliy Ivanovich Churkin, head of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs information service, to tell us how the preparation of this treaty is going.

[Begin recording] [Churkin] Things are going well. Today's talks between the Soviet and Hungarian foreign ministers have confirmed that both sides consider it necessary to move toward the elaboration and conclusion of a new treaty which would create a qualitatively new legal and treaty basis for the further development of Soviet-Hungarian relations. Some provisions must still be agreed upon, in particular, provisions which would deal with questions of security in a way that will satisfy both countries, the Soviet Union as well as Hungary. I should like to say that we are not dramatizing this aspect of the treaty and the talks, and I am not revealing a big secret here by saying that Soviet Union does not expect any threat to its security from the Hungarian Republic. However, this aspect of the matter is being considered in many international legal documents and we, as well as our Hungarian colleagues, think that this question can be solved.

[Levin] Vitaliy Ivanovich, I have an impression that in the relations between the former allies emotions were often running high. What is the major factor now—the same old emotions or realism?

[Churkin] Maybe this was so. For some time after the changes, dramatic and radical, which took place in the East European countries at the end of 1989, the emotions really overflowed and in some degree affected the

course and state of our relations with these countries. As a result, there was a certain period of reflection. This period of reflection has ended, I should say, in a logically inevitable way. It has ended, as we see it, with people in East European countries realizing that they cannot live without the Soviet Union after all, simply for geographical reasons, and also because our countries are connected by too many things—in economic, cultural, and other spheres, in other words, in all the things that constitute the very matter of relations between the countries. Thus, the course toward the development of full-scale multilateral, good and lasting relations has been adopted now, and we too will definitely support and follow this course. [end recording]

CSFR's Dubcek Continues Moscow Visit

Meets Gorbachev, Comments

LD2305172791 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 23 May 91

[Text] The chairman of the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly has taken part in an international congress in Moscow to commemorate Dr. Andrey Sakharov. Alexander Dubcek had a short discussion with President Mikhail Gorbachev, who also attended the congress.

Immediately after the discussion Mr. Dubcek spoke in an interview. What was the discussion about?

[Dubcek in vernacular fading into English translation] The discussion was about contacts between the two nations, the necessity of promoting economic ties and a Czechoslovak-Soviet treaty. President Gorbachev agreed the two countries had already laid a good foundation by signing documents. Czechoslovak-Soviet partner relations will be equal and mutually advantageous. The president and myself believe our two nations must carry on economic cooperation. The two countries [words indistinct] signal change when democracy gained momentum. This brings our two nations together. They must seek more points in common and forget everything that used to divide them.

Dubcek said the changes would take the two nations much time. Society faces economic and ethnic problems and the questions of administrative decentralization and conversion. Czechoslovakia must advance ties with Soviet republics. Relations between Slovakia and the Ukraine can prove fruitful indeed. So too can trade, economic, cultural, and other ties with the Russian Federation.

All this does not rule out cooperation at federal level. In short, contacts must become more comprehensive. Democracy in both the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia is (?too) fragile. It is yet to receive legal enactment. The two nations hope to learn on the move and correct their actions but this is the two nations' common choice. Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union are only beginning to get action on it.

Received by Lukyanov

PM2305140791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
22 May 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] On 21 May USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A.I. Lukyanov received CSFR Federal Assembly Chairman A. Dubcek.

Their frank conversation saw a thorough exchange of opinions on a wide range of questions concerning Soviet-Czechoslovak relations and confirmation of interest in improving and expanding bilateral cooperation.

R. Slansky, CSFR Ambassador to the USSR, was present during the conversation.

Returns Home, Comments

PM2305142991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 May 91 Union Edition p 1

[Unattributed report from news agencies roundup: "Dubcek's Statement"]

[Text] CSFR Federal Assembly Chairman Dubcek stated on his return from Moscow: "I think my trip was extremely fruitful. My meetings with Soviet leaders were very useful. We discussed the most urgent questions of bilateral relations. We talked first and foremost about broadening inter-legislative contacts, fully restoring economic ties between our countries, and also about problems relating to the state and legal apparatus of the USSR and Czechoslovakia. During the talks we also examined issues relating to the rapid conclusion of a Soviet-Czechoslovak treaty, which will strengthen mutual relations and have a positive effect on the situation in Central Europe."

Pavlov, Bulgarian Prime Ministers Discuss Treaty

PM2305105191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 May 91 Moscow Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Soviet-Bulgarian Talks"]

[Text] USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov met Bulgarian Council of Ministers Chairman D. Popov, who is making a brief working visit to the Soviet Union, 17 May.

In the course of the talks both sides stressed the tremendous importance of renewing the treaty-legal base of Soviet-Bulgarian relations and, in particular, of preparing a new treaty in line with contemporary political realities and the traditions of friendship, cooperation, and mutual respect.

CPSU's Ivashko Receives Bulgaria's Tomov

PM2105114791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 May 91 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Meeting at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] On 18 May V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met with A. Tomov, deputy chairman of the BSP [Bulgarian Socialist Party] Supreme Council and deputy prime minister of Bulgaria.

A wide range of questions of CPSU-BSP cooperation was discussed during a friendly conversation in which V.L. Musatov, first deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, participated.

West Europe

Further Reportage on Andreotti Visit

Talks With Gorbachev

CM2405160091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 May Second Edition pp 1,4

[Text] Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti met in Moscow 22 May to discuss major issues concerning the current situation and the role of Soviet-Italian cooperation in resolving them.

Gorbachev and Andreotti were quick to understand each other in the style of well-wishing openness and absolute trust characteristic of them. Over the years of their personal contacts, it became a rule with them to put questions clearly and give definite answers.

With frankness that is natural for the dialogue with his Italian friend, Gorbachev described the situation in the country, expressing his estimates of prospects for reforming and renewing the Soviet state and defining economic difficulties and basic principles of the anti-crisis program.

The president analysed domestic tasks within the context of world development and a possible new phase of the Soviet Union's cooperation with the rest of the world. A transition to such a phase would give a serious boost to perestroika, the success of which everyone is interested.

There is an utter necessity and a chance precisely now to set the beginning of a new quality of cooperation, Gorbachev said. Andreotti agreed with such an approach, voicing a number of profound considerations on problems that had arisen during democratic transformations in the Soviet Union and gave reasons in favour of the Soviet Union's involvement in affairs that are of vital importance to the whole world.

The president of the USSR and the chairman of the Italian Government expressed deep sorrow over the heavy loss suffered by the international community—the perfidious assassination of Rajiv Gandhi.

They spoke of the importance of Soviet-U.S. cooperation as an integral and major factor in world and European politics and of topical and most delicate aspects of the

European process after the adoption of the Charter of Paris, and of a joint quest for a post-war settlement in the Middle East.

Soviet-Italian economic contacts had been earlier examined in detail by Andreotti and Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov.

Therefore during the top-level talks, these matters were touched upon only in principle—from the viewpoint of Italy's assistance to and solidarity with the Soviet Union at the present difficult stage. [Moscow TASS in English at 2040 GMT on 22 May carries a similar report which adds: "Some private matters that are appropriate in such close relations between the leadership of the two countries were also discussed."]

Gorbachev, Andreotti News Conference

LD2205144491 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 1202 GMT 22 May 91

[News conference by President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti at USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow; introduced and moderated by Vitaliy Ignatenko; Andreotti in Italian with simultaneous translation into Russian—live]

[Text] [Ignatenko] Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, esteemed comrades, we are beginning the news conference of Giulio Andreotti, chairman of the Italian Council of Ministers, and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the USSR.

[Gorbachev] Good day, esteemed ladies and gentlemen! Mr. Andreotti and I have just completed talks which went on for four hours, and I would like to say that these were very useful and very important talks. This is necessary and essential work inasmuch as Soviet-Italian relations have always been noted for their stability and so that they should be so and that they should yield positive results, and even more that they should enter a higher stage of cooperation and trust, with regular meetings, conversations, exchanges of opinions, and comparison of opinions on all kinds of questions, especially at such a stormy and swift-flowing time in which you and I are living.

It is even difficult for me to say just now what we did not talk about, rather than what we did talk about; I would say that in one way or another we touched upon all the main subjects which are at the center of the world public's attention. And there was great coincidence or similarity, proximity of views on the majority of questions. This opens up new opportunities for continuing our cooperation.

I informed Mr. Andreotti about our domestic affairs in the current stage. Recently I and many of you here met when President Mitterrand visited, and since then new

events have occurred and new decisions have been adopted which the Italian prime minister, Mr. Andreotti, and I discussed.

I am grateful to the government and people of Italy for the invariable feeling of solidarity which is manifest both in their political support, economic cooperation, and, quite simply, human solidarity with the immense business we are conducting here.

We found opportunities for broadening our cooperation, not only in the area of commerce but, first and foremost, in implementing future new projects and, perhaps, with a move to new forms of cooperation. In any event, instructions have been given on this score, and we hope that there will be moves forward in this aspect of cooperation.

We exchanged [words indistinct] on questions that related, I would say, to the European situation in the current context, and we came to the conclusions, as I understand it, that the present-day situation in Europe contains immense opportunities—and they must be utilized—for cooperation in all directions on the European continent to gather force and, at the same time, we stressed that this cooperation is necessary, too, not only in the interests of the peoples of Europe, but also throughout the world community.

We had a very thorough exchange of opinions on the situation in the Middle East, first and foremost on approaches and on a quest for a solution to problems that exist there, which have existed for a long time and which have arisen as a result of the Persian crisis.

We dealt with questions on disarmament. Mr. Andreotti expressed interest in how we are hoping the mission by our chief of general staff in Washington will end. My answer was that we are hoping that it will be positive.

In any case, I again had the chance, during this working visit by Mr. Andreotti, to see for myself that in his person I have a privileged partner, an experienced politician, with whom one can and must communicate and exchange ideas as often as possible, and I would like to express my deepest satisfaction with the results of the visit.

[Andreotti] What President Gorbachev said about the usefulness and constructiveness of our meeting, which is a continuation of the cooperation and mutual trust between the Soviet Union and Italy, which found a concrete expression a year ago in the signing of a number of documents, including that of an important treaty on friendship.

This cooperation is developing in a number of areas, from the economic one, in interstate agreements, and through a number of contacts being made at the current time by industrialists and trade bodies at various levels with their colleagues in the Soviet Union, taking into account the prospects opened up by the new Soviet legislation and the already existing legislation, as well as

the norms to be submitted for discussion by the Supreme Soviet for its approval in the next few weeks, which are to allow the direct participation of foreign, Italian capital, and of Italian firms here in the Soviet Union.

It will be our mutual contribution toward the implementation of the idea of the common home, which is the background for all our political lines in the past years. President Gorbachev and I also had an opportunity to talk about the most topical international problems and about issues relating to the consequences of the Persian Gulf crisis, including the necessity to examine the Middle East's problems—specifically the Palestinian problem and the problem of Lebanon. These specific problems now may be examined with greater optimism than in the past as cooperation at the international level between the Soviet Union and the Western world, the United States of America in particular, is in itself very active cooperation.

We express hope that the climate will be restored—a climate of work aimed at further arms reduction, of that very work that was at the basis of overcoming the Cold War and that proved its effectiveness in resolving and setting out to resolve various crises that in the past used to be nurtured by the existence of two confronting blocs in our world.

We see a certain novelty in a positive—very positive—assessment taking into account the rapprochement that has taken place now between the Soviet Union and the PRC. President Gorbachev told me about his recent talks with the general secretary of the CPC, and I must say that here it is a question of contributing—directly and indirectly—toward making the international situation less complex. I think that there is a need for this cooperation and such cooperation, starting with the cooperation within the UN framework and in the world on the whole. We must encourage peaceful competition and not enforced competition and rivalry.

President Gorbachev and I discussed the murder of former Indian Prime Minister Gandhi while stressing how necessary it is to resist any manifestations of violence in the world and to bring up the future generation in a spirit of cooperation, the need to work toward most competition in all spheres and not in spheres of military confrontation and manifestations of violence.

I hope that this policy will be continued. We reaffirmed to President Gorbachev Italy's convinced support for the policy of perestroika, the success of which meets not only the interests of the Soviet Union but also the interests of everyone, since we think that it is precisely along this road that a system of international relations has to be built, which in the future might avoid a repetition of the tragic mistakes of the past. There are, of course, many problems. These are problems that arise from the transitional stage from the old system to the new system. I hope that no one feels any nostalgia for the old systems. Of course, the current Soviet leadership does not feel this nostalgia, rather the opposite. It feels

great responsibility but also great pride, because it is engaged in building an entirely different world, both inside the country and outside the Soviet Union. It is in this spirit that we examined issues today, on which we built our talks today, first with the prime minister and then with President Gorbachev. I share his view that direct contact is very useful for exchanging impressions and for working together more intensively.

[Ignatenko] Thank you very much. Go ahead.

[LA STAMPA correspondent] A question to the president and one to the chairman if I may, Mikhail Sergeyevich, how do you assess, after these talks, the problems, chances, and possibilities of your participating in the forthcoming meeting of the big seven. And a question to Mr. Andreotti; I will speak in Italian. [In Italian with simultaneous Russian translation] Gorbachev has spoken about the prospects of forms of cooperation between our countries. I would like to ask a precise question: Are there plans for participation by Italy in projects for the conversion of the USSR's military industry? Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Although neither I nor Mr. Andreotti touched upon this theme—of the Group of Seven and perestroika—in our introductory speeches, nonetheless, this theme was present in our talks. We look upon this theme in the context of the development of international ties and links in recent years and, quite naturally, with each year these international relations are enriched with new forms of cooperation. I attribute great importance to the functioning of such an institution as the Seven. And in the past, when a routine meeting was taking place in Paris, as you may recall I sent a letter to President Mitterrand, who read out this letter for the participants in the Seven. To my satisfaction, it was received with understanding, and the problems that were raised in it were seriously and thoroughly examined and discussed. We maintain active links with all the countries who are members of the Seven on a bilateral level. But now the need really arises for the USSR to have the opportunity to raise and to express its points of view—and it does have some—at one of the meetings of the Seven. This idea has arisen and is being discussed, not just in the press but also in political circles. We touched on this theme today, and as I understand it we had a positive exchange of opinions on this subject; I feel optimistic about this.

[Andreotti] The letter that President Gorbachev sent to the incumbent chairman, President Mitterrand, two years ago was an extremely important one, since in the past in each of the final communiques of the group—the Group of Seven—we turned to the Soviet Union with an invitation to cooperate in programs of cooperation and development for the Third World. This invitation was never taken up. People continued to talk about a North-South program—in fact it was about a North-West-South program—and the Soviet Union had its own North-East-South program. At that time, when a very successful dialogue had begun between East and West, it

was true that it was necessary to move in this direction, and President Gorbachev's letter enabled the ice to be broken. I believe that in the current situation it would be expedient to ensure that the Seven keep in contact by means of annual meetings. Naturally, this depends on decisions that are taken not by just one country but all the countries, and, of course, I must refer with special respect to the role of the incumbent chairman, Great Britain. I may be bold enough to say publicly that we have a very favorable attitude; at the moment we are going through a turning point in international affairs, and we are examining problems connected with the consequences of the crisis in the Persian Gulf. This also takes into consideration the fact that there are problems that we are dealing with within the framework of the Seven that require a logical need for cooperation on the part of the Soviet Union. Apart from general political problems, one may also speak, let us say, about problems connected with the environment, how it is possible to plan the environment on a world scale. There is coordination with the Soviet Union in another sphere—the fight against narcotics that we are dealing with in a serious manner. It requires a considerable contribution and support on the part of the USSR, and I hope that this may find embodiment in those forms that have been mentioned today.

As far as the second question is concerned on new prospects for cooperation in the sphere of the economy and industry—including, in particular, exchange in the participation of enterprises as well as cooperation in the sphere of convertible industry—this is an integral part of the package of agreements that were signed during President Gorbachev's visit to Rome. A working group exists that collates and studies these problems, and we would like this to be a model for the whole world. For this problem exists—the problem of conversion in the military industry. I may say that we are progressing, and there will be an opportunity: an exhibition that is being held jointly by the Soviet Union and Italy in Bologna is precisely on this very subject of conversion in the military industry. This is an active contribution that we are making to the policy of disarmament.

Since we know that otherwise there exists a paradox. A worker in the military industry, being a peace lover at heart, yet fears a reduction in the production of military output because he is afraid of being left without work. For this reason we have to try and avoid this paradox.

[Unidentified correspondent] A question for President Gorbachev: Do you think that today relations with Italy and Western Europe are better than the USSR's relations with the United States? Why hasn't the date for a meeting with Bush been decided yet? Thank you very much. I would like to ask President [title as heard] Andreotti if the intensification of cooperation was also discussed within the scope of the further development of the Paris CSCE agreement, including the creation of an anticrisis center in Berlin. Thank you.

[Gorbachev] The first question: I think that as far as the political dialogue is concerned, participation, cooperation within the scope of the Helsinki process, there is in evidence a substantial degree of mutual understanding and broad cooperation between the Soviet Union and both the states of Western Europe and the United States. Moreover, by virtue of a certain weight that distinguishes and singles out both the United States and the Soviet Union as major military powers, in certain spheres this dialogue is, perhaps, even of a more active nature in the Soviet-American relationship. So I would say that as concerns this area of cooperation in the very important spheres of security, disarmament, seeking approaches to restructuring international relations and switching them to a normal, healthy channel, here we are all working together, and I hope, not without results, at least that's what I think. What has occurred in the world, and what we call the beginning of a new prolonged period in the development of human civilization, this is all our common achievement. As concerns economic cooperation, here, I have to say, there are certain differences, and not only between Western Europe and the United States but also in that with different countries of Western Europe, there are differing degrees of cooperation and differing forms of cooperation. But still, I think it's worth mentioning Soviet-American cooperation, as concerns economic cooperation.

It seems to me that not everything has been done yet to ensure that these relations proceed normally. There are still many obstacles that arose during the cold war. It seems that we have already opened up with regard to the military sphere. We know very well what each has at their disposal. Moreover, I think that in the main we know what various countries will have at their disposal in the near future. This makes it possible to say that we are open to each other. There can be nothing unexpected here.

Nonetheless COCOM [Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls] still exists and in quite a severe form. I think that this system is a sort of relic of the cold war and nothing more. That is how I would describe it. You may recall that I said there was a Soviet-French project to lay a transcontinental information system. After this project had been signed it was discovered that there were some obstacles on the part of Cocom. It is strange that here too Cocom found some sort of dirty tricks, so to say. In general these are still all the things that are dragging along behind us from the period of the cold war.

Or else, take our relations with the United States which are burdened with some sort of, well I will not say ultimatum-like conditions, but with preliminary conditions. Moreover, perhaps for some time this had some significance because there is always the historical situation for the appearance of some particular decision or the appearance of particular mechanisms. But now much has changed and these restrictions remain. In particular, there are some restrictions that seem to indicate that they want to interfere in our internal affairs.

You know, if we try to seek out each other's weak points and things that we do not like, then we will always be able to find them in each other. The main point is to acknowledge for each people the right to freedom of choice, to recognize our differences, to acknowledge that these differences are not a source of confrontation but a source of comparison, competition, and, consequently, of movement. There are various peoples. Each people has its own culture and history. Each country is at a particular stage of economic development and there will always be differences.

I don't see any tragedy in this, just the opposite; it is a stimulus, even interesting, to study each other.

So we won't push our own models on each other. We won't dictate. Let us master new forms of cooperation that are in accordance with today's realities, today's stage in the development of international relations. Here too probably we have a very difficult transition, and everything cannot be solved at once.

So there are some differences, and the most obstacles on the road to economic cooperation still lie in the Soviet-American area. This has to be noted. It is a fact.

As far as the date of the future meeting of the presidents of the United States of America and of the Soviet Union is concerned, my understanding is that our latest contact points to this—including my telephone conversation with President George Bush—that both sides want this meeting to take place, but since the situation is such that probably everyone would like these meetings to be the most productive because of this the subject or idea of some kind of interim meeting cropped up before. Today we are talking about a basic meeting that would discuss disarmament questions, and in particular, we intend all questions to have been cleared up and the road to be open for a ratification of the conventional arms treaty by the time of this meeting so that we could clear away the final obstacles—they are not very great ones—on the path to a treaty on a 50-percent reduction of nuclear strategic offensive weapons. So I have come away from our latest conversation with the impression that there is an aspiration by the Soviet Union, by the leadership of the Soviet Union, and of the United States of America, to make a move toward this meeting, but it is clear since a number of questions still need to be solved that we have not been able to set this meeting, or, rather, a date for it. That is my answer.

[Andreotti] The reference to the all-European process in itself is the key to the reply to this trilateral problem, the problem of relations between the USSR, the United States, and Western Europe. The all-European process marked the first change, alteration, in international politics. All the Europeans were in agreement, including the USSR, but excluding at that moment Albania which at the time did not wish to participate. All at that time were in full agreement that the United States and Canada are a part of Europe and should participate in ensuring security and cooperation in Europe. I recall the

criticisms that were made then when people said: How can this be? Brezhnev will sign this agreement and at the same time will speak about restricted sovereignty? But we replied: Brezhnev will depart, but the Helsinki principles will remain. And when the Paris conference solemnly confirmed the spirit of Helsinki which received specific embodiment in the treaty, the limits and bases for this cooperation were laid down.

Of course, things that have to a certain extent been inherited from the past cannot be changed in one day. There are problems that require a gradual approach. It seems to me, nonetheless, that we can say that these relations, these new relations between the USSR and the United States, not only exist but have already led to considerable results.

This morning President Gorbachev said: If this climate had not existed, what would the consequences have been of the crisis in the Persian Gulf and the occupation of Kuwait? Indeed, there would have been a danger of the Third World War breaking out and complications on a world scale. The fact that in the United Nations Organization, during the making of very important decisions and within the framework of the Security Council, the American position and the Soviet position, one could observe a tendency of the drawing together of the American position and the Soviet position. This signifies not only the renewal of the role of the UN Organization, but more likely the beginning of a constructive role for it.

Ten days ago De Michelis and I had the opportunity to meet President Bush, and we can state that the desire exists to have positive relations with the USSR. The President told us that he is trying to remove the obstacles and the legal difficulties in congress with regard to the problem of credit for grain supplies.

I cite this as just one example which was on the table at that very moment. It seems to me that it is there and we must say: Yes, there are still some remnants of COCOM or something else, but when one tackles matters with goodwill, all difficulties are soluble. For years we considered that it was impossible to make an agreement on missiles, because we could not reach an agreement on monitoring, for the Soviet Union unfortunately regarded its inspectors as spies. When the United States decided on the question of giving visas to Soviet citizens, you would think it was a matter of extracting Adam's rib to create Eve. But now scientists have worked on the matter, your scientist Velikhov has been to us in Rome, with U.S. and French scientists. They worked out forms of monitoring nuclear weapons, which then came up at the Geneva meeting a few months later. It is important that it was an impulse toward cooperation. We want this spirit to remain, to grow stronger, because indeed in the last few years it has represented for us a great hope for the whole world, which has led to changes in thinking throughout the world.

We did not speak specifically today of an anti-crisis center, but all of our meeting was held in the spirit of the

most important advance of these trends, which are seen in the general European process as one of the most distinctive signs. This is the direction we must follow.

[Unidentified correspondent in Italian] You said that you discussed many international problems. Did the problems of the Horn of Africa come up, in the light of recent events?

[Andreotti] In order to make peace in the region of the Horn of Africa, the Soviet Union and we, over a lengthy period, like everyone else, lent our support in the past in order to find the necessary solution. This is a very complex region and if one considers the past a kind of minuet dance has been played out here. One country turned first to the East and then to the West and they fought each other and, furthermore, they fought with weapons received from another country. Recently, persistent efforts have been made so that the effort for advancement can lead to a settlement without destroying the state integrity of Ethiopia. We now voice the hope that the new situation following the departure of President Mengistu, [changes thought] sometimes new facts are needed in order to bring things to completion. It seems to me that the wider autonomy, to which Eritrea undoubtedly has the right, must exist within some form of relations which will not be to the detriment of more general living conditions.

I would like to mention the tragedy of destruction and death in a country which is the poorest country in Africa. This is in connection with the situation that has come about in a neighboring country, Somalia, a very complicated situation, where again tribal and inter-tribal contradictions have arisen, where it seems in the past that the contradictions had already been overcome. We hope that on both sides we will show them complete goodwill in order to help them, but first and foremost they must help each other by internally ending the armed clashes.

[Gorbachev] I should like to add to this that we were in complete agreement and understanding concerning the fact that our countries have a unique opportunity, in view of the ties that have formed, to display goodwill and promote the search for accord and peace in that land.

[Unidentified correspondent, in Russian] Italian REPUBBLICA newspaper. Mikhail Sergeyevich, would you say if the Soviet Union is going to be able to take part in the next meeting of the seven? And in general, what would you like these member countries of the seven to realize and what would you like to hear from them in response, specifically? [changes to Italian] Mr Andreotti, Gorbachev has said that he spoke to you in detail about the economic situation, the socio-political one. What is your impression, is the Soviet leadership today more worried, more anxious, or on the contrary, more optimistic than in the past?

[Gorbachev] So, it seems, I have already outlined the first, [changes thought] one of the themes for a possible meeting in the context of the seven, that this would be an indicator of embarking on a new form of cooperation at

a very important stage of restructuring international relations. We have a great many concerns in common, after all. And I would not like to repeat myself now, perhaps I could just accentuate a thing or two. That is, problems of security and disarmament, and also problems of the use of resources, problems of ecology, to say nothing of problems connected with giving aid to regions in difficult development conditions, experiencing great difficulties. So all this prompts me to pose this question about participating—and the form this would take is a matter for discussion—in the work of the seven? Well I would again put forward the theme, one which we have recently already examined in this hall, namely perestroika and the seven. I am convinced that the peoples of those countries need perestroika, and so does the whole world, no less than the Soviet peoples, taking into consideration that today's Soviet Union is one of the reliable, solid, and constructive foundations for today's world, and I am confident that this role is simply irreplaceable. If we lose this bulwark now, then all the consequences must be worked out.

Therefore, it is not only we who are interested in the success of perestroika, we all need it. The Soviet Union is a world too large to just look on indifferently, while some rub their hands in anticipation: Let us see what will happen to them next, whether we might catch some fish in the murky waters. I think that here we are committed, whatever position you might be taking—the strategic one, the one with a military aspect, the economic side. All this is very serious. If it is possible to find 100 billion for overcoming the problems of just one crisis, then in order to enable perestroika to succeed and so that, as a result of the deep reforms, the country will turn toward the person—if we mean the internal trends—and toward the world if we mean the external trends—the question of cooperation with the Soviet Union will be a game worth the candle, I think. [Budapest Kossuth Radio Network in Hungarian at 0500 GMT on 25 May broadcasts a recorded report by correspondent Gyorgy Bolgar, who was present at the news conference. Bolgar says: "THE NEW YORK TIMES and a few other U.S. papers made a most awkward mistake on a very sensitive international issue, and by the time they could correct this several leaders from George Bush to Hungarian President Arpad Goncz had already made statements, or even had discussions about the mistaken information.

"What is in question is that in yesterday's issue the paper published a front-page report according to which Gorbachev, at his Moscow news conference, asked for \$100 billion in Western aid. From today's paper it transpires that the Soviet president did not make such a statement. All he said was that the stabilization of the Soviet economy is also worth as much as the Gulf war—which by the way, cost \$50 to 60 billion.

"The report on the request for the \$100 billion was pulled out of the air—literally—because according to THE NEW YORK TIMES it had originally been reported by the BBC Monitoring Service."]

I think that this theme is a very important one for our exchange at this meeting, if it will take place. And by the way, the time demands that it will be most desirable to have this meeting this year. As for the second part of your question, at the meeting with the heads of the seven I should like to hear suggestions about how we should be interacting in order to facilitate strengthening of the positive tendencies that have appeared and are gathering strength and which we simply cannot sacrifice. Well, so far this is it, generally speaking.

[Andreotti] (?Replying) to the second part of the question, President Gorbachev, as in our previous meeting, told me about the development of the internal situation, in particular about the procedures currently being undertaken in order to create a new foundation for the union. At present a transition stage is under way and, as for the future, I think that, in spite of all the difficulties to which an operation like this inevitably leads, there are no grounds for pessimism. One must look attentively, to see that the interests of all others actually enjoy maximum development in the direction of centripetal tendencies rather than centrifugal tendencies which perhaps made themselves more strongly felt at some moments. If one thinks about that seriously, they do not correspond to any part of the population that is currently engaged in a search for a new equilibrium and new structures. I think that from that point of view, I repeat that there are no grounds for pessimism.

[Unidentified correspondent] Italian Television. Today a very great deal is being said about meetings. Does this signify, as you said, that the meeting with President Bush will be the main meeting? Does this mean that it is impossible to resolve all the problems in the first half of the year, as was thought in your meeting with President Bush? And the second meeting, speaking to President Andreotti, you spoke of the possibility that the pope will visit Moscow. Can you let us know something specific about that?

Mr. Andreotti, I would like to ask you a question? What kind of differences did you have? Regarding the Near East, what did the closeness of your positions on it consist of?

[Gorbachev] I think that simply as events are developing the meetings we mentioned here and about which we have spoken in greater detail with Mr. Andreotti, are desirable, extremely desirable. But it is clear that one must meet people halfway where there is a mutual desire, having traversed a certain path, and having done a certain volume of work. At the present time, as far as the meeting with U.S. President George Bush is concerned, I can only iterate what I have said. We are working jointly and I hope constructively. We shall wait for the results of the trip by our chief of general staff.

Essentially, one issue remains. And in my view it in no way affects the correlation of forces and does not infringe upon the balance of these forces. Clearly, it is necessary

to find a correct interpretation and a political elucidation of this question and to remove, perhaps, some lack of understanding. Well, in any case, there is one question, but all the others have, essentially, in one way or another, already been solved on the basis of mutual cooperation.

As far as a meeting within the framework of the seven is concerned, it will take place insofar as this regular institution occurs every year, and today it is the turn of the authorities of Great Britain to be the hosts, and as to how the idea of the participation of the leadership of the Soviet Union is to be implemented, well, this needs to be the subject of consultation by the leaders of the seven, and opinions need to be exchanged, as Chairman Andreotti said, and I welcome the positive statement which he made on this question.

In any case, I have begun to ponder what I should like to say at this meeting. If I don't happen to be there, then, nevertheless, I will still have something to say.

[Ignatenko] Please, Mr [name indistinct]

[Unidentified correspondent] One other question was put to you regarding the pope.

[Gorbachev] Signor Andreotti and I had just met and we had an open mutual briefing regarding the weather in Moscow and Rome, and who had the better links with that great office in the sky—the Moscow Government or the Italian Government. I said that God was closer to you, but Signor Andreotti reacted accordingly and, in this connection, I said that the subject had been raised—it had somehow become developed—that we were satisfied with how our relations—the Soviet Union's—with the Vatican were developing. They are indeed developing to our mutual satisfaction, perfectly satisfactorily, they have acquired a certain dynamism, and I would even say that they are progressing so quickly that we are not having enough time to examine certain issues, and it may be some problems are arising and we shall try to comment upon them and, together with the ambassador of his holiness, examine them.

In any case, I would welcome the way our relations with the Vatican are developing. In connection with this, when considering the prospects for these relations, we mentioned in general that there is an agreement for the future—that the pope's visit to our country lies ahead of us. I think that in order to achieve this we will together choose the most appropriate moment, and I think it will take place in due course.

[Andreotti] With regard to problems of the Near East, I should like to say that we have common goals, i.e. a specific answer to the lawful political expectations of the Palestinian people and the normalization of the situation in Lebanon. In the present situation there are hopes—slightly greater hopes compared to the past—because we see that the U.S. Administration is consistent with what Bush said in the United Nations on 1 October, that after solving the Kuwaiti problem we have to get out to tackle

the problems of the Palestinians in the Lebanon, and that generally we observe greater sensitivity on the part of the Bush-Baker Administration to these problems. A return to the conviction that the Soviet Union's contribution is very useful in tackling this problem gives us a certain optimism. Thus, thanks to the relations between the Soviet Union and the Arab world, and because it is not by chance that the Soviet foreign minister has visited the state of Israel for the first time in history, it means that conditions are being created which, we can say, received a very high assessment on the part of the U.S. side, as they provide new opportunities for considering and tackling the problem. The main thing is to start a dialogue, and at present that would be impossible. Through a dialogue one can naturally arrive at a solution.

[Unidentified speaker] Inasmuch as my colleague Ignatenko usually gives the floor to Italian journalists, I would like to give the floor to a Soviet journalist.

[Unidentified correspondent] This is the all-Arab newspaper AL HAYAT. I would like to say that the countries of the Third World most often experience discrimination when it is a matter of rapprochement between East and West. And in this connection I would like to ask you precisely about this. Don't you think, Mr. President and Mr. Chairman, that the present rapprochement or the possible even greater rapprochement between East and West is intensifying the fears of the countries of the developing world, that this will be at the expense of these countries, at their expense, the more so as we know that you, too, Mr. Gorbachev and you, Mr. Andreotti, have been promoters of the idea that this should not turn out to be the case, should not be at the expense of these interests.

[Gorbachev] I can only confirm that on this score I have already been voicing my opinion in the past few years. I think that all developed countries, in East or West, wherever they are situated, must feel and realize their huge responsibility for what is taking place—well, as you put it—in the Third World, in the world of developing countries, where the peoples are experiencing great difficulties because of certain historic causes.

It seems to me that our civilization will not be able to successfully advance, harmonize international relations, or improve them, without resolving this key problem, and, on the whole, if these problems which are present there are left without attention and if the gap between the developed countries and the developing countries grows, the inflammable material which is already accumulating there may have a stronger effect than a nuclear explosion. This is a very serious situation.

Once I was reflecting in this way before one of the leaders of the leading countries of the West: That, if one takes an individual capitalist, he has already long ago understood that in order for him to set production going, what is needed is technology, the introduction of the achievements of science. For this a new type of worker, too, is

needed. And he must bear the expenditures in training such a worker and he also must allow for certain expenditures in maintaining the family. This he realized and is doing.

As regards the collective capitalist in the person of the Western countries—this is how, I repeat, how I was discussing this—here he lacks an understanding of the fact that this is robbery, and otherwise [changes thought] at that time the relationship had to be called precisely that. This can lead to only one thing: that it will be accompanied by prosperity and enrichment in one part of the globe and by further impoverishment and the growing of social and all other diseases in the developing countries. And this is abnormal.

The entire capitalist world too must realize—here I would unite all the developed countries wherever they are, in the East or the West—realize that this is a common responsibility. Because it is a question of our civilization, something all of whose parts are really very mutually dependent on one another. I think this realization, this understanding, is growing among political circles in the developed countries. I think this subject, and this has already been mentioned here by Chairman Andreotti, is examined fairly regularly, including at that same Paris session where it was the central topic and concerning which I wrote my letter to it and expressed my thoughts. So I think that the process of better understanding this mutual dependence is nevertheless under way today, along with the realization that it is in combination with the process of disarmament that we should simultaneously also examine the processes of development.

[Andreotti] I should like to say that there exists a double preoccupation in the Third World countries. One preoccupation is that Europe, in achieving greater internal accord, will be less concerned with the problems of other countries, and another preoccupation is that rapprochement between East and West may harm to a certain extent and not facilitate and help the Third World countries. As to the first part, I should like to say that it is not so. We believe that that would mean a failure on the part of all Europe if in achieving an accord, a just accord between ourselves to build a common European home, we would no longer be interested in these problems and those countries that lie outside Europe even more than before or at least to the same extent as before. As to the second preoccupation, it is necessary to take into account here that during the cold war hotbeds of crisis appeared very frequently not for objective reasons but only as a reflection of the cold war. Of course, it is not sufficient for the whole world to embark on peace thanks to East-West accord, but East-West accord is a big contribution to the common cause. As I see it, the final aim should be what a Brazilian Bishop said: God did not create a first or a second or a third world. God created a single world. Therefore we must come to an understanding of the fact that the world is one. There is neither a first, second or third world.

[Correspondent Terekhov] The INTERFAX news agency. Mikhail Sergeyevich, I have formed the impression that a new balance of political forces has come about in the USSR's internal political climate. Forces that are against perestroika—and recently the term “restructuring of perestroika” [perestroika perestroiki] has even appeared - and forces that are against the transition to the market are just getting ready to put up probably the strongest fight that there has ever been against perestroika over these five years. Tell us please whether I am right, whether you see this threat and what will be your future steps and possible decrees to enshrine the transition to market conditions. And a second question, if I might put it to the Comrade President and Mr. Prime Minister: You spoke today about many problems, but of late the very serious factor of the hot internal political instability in Yugoslavia has once again entered the political stage. Was this issue discussed during your talks, and how do you see the Yugoslav factor influencing the development of the situation in Europe?

[Gorbachev] Well, Comrade Terekhov, your question is a fairly lengthy one, and I feel natural contradictions as how to give a brief answer to this lengthy question. I would say that your question probably stems from those emotions that we sense there are in society. These emotions at the present time are connected with the fact that we have arrived at this very stage and phase of real profound reforms. As far as the multinational state is concerned, we shall on the 24th, that is the day after tomorrow, be once again meeting in the preparatory committee and indeed drawing up the final version of the union treaty, which is due to be presented to the republican supreme soviets for approval. This then is a matter of concern to everybody.

A thing that is now under discussion, that has been thoroughly discussed over recent weeks in all spheres of society and, of course, in the supreme soviets, government bodies, trade unions, industrial associations, work collectives and in the press is the anti-crisis program. This discussion has also finished, but in this respect very much anxiety and many opposing viewpoints were expressed. On the one hand there was acknowledgement that the program, the view was expressed that the Pavlov program is a repeat of past programs, the programs of the previous government. On the other hand the view was expressed that the anti-crisis program of the Pavlov Cabinet is an anti-people and inhumane program.

Well, I could say a lot more here about what was talked about, but that is not the point. But our people are listening to all this, going through it and wondering about where we are, what is happening to us. Naturally, problems of a political nature are also being discussed, because political reform, too, is continuing. And not just that—something else is important, too, and that is within the framework of the political process an awareness has grown in society that what is needed now is somehow to put immediate interests and group interests to one side, and achieve an accord. For it is precisely on the basis of this understanding that the well-known

statement which we have already spoken about—Nine Plus One—came to be in society. And there has been a lot of debate around all this—who has given way, who has gained, who has lost, what does this thesis mean, what does that thesis mean. Generally speaking, we have come to a phase, a phase of the most profound changes, decisive changes, and perfectly understandable anxiety and, again, a clash of opinions.

I think that at least we should bear in mind that to achieve success on the course toward transformation and reforms, a course of perestroika, there are three tasks which are interconnected. We need public accord. And the people will not forgive those politicians who toss up slogans and create instability and tension in society. On the contrary, they will support precisely those who will come out—and not just come out for—but will find specific forms of this achievement of accord. This is what we need, and I would say this is the main, the first condition. The second condition is that we must proceed radically along the path of a transition to new forms of economic life, move decisively toward a mixed economy and a market. This is also necessary. But to achieve this we must now, first and foremost, stabilize our economic links, overcome the slump in production which has occurred, and on this score fairly—well, a whole complex of measures is being adopted. I do not want to enumerate them right now; they are in the program and they take up a separate section.

We must continue our efforts toward a normalization of the financial system and currency circulation in the country and of the consumer market. These are also urgent tasks. And here too we have difficult paths to travel.

So, the first thing is accord. The second thing is the continuation of the economic reforms and, I would even say, their radicalization, because we only just have enough time. And the third thing is that we must do everything inside the country in order to create preconditions in the very near future for broadening cooperation with the Western countries, and in order to embark on new forms of cooperation. And to achieve this we have much to do, both to insure the protection of foreign investment and to create confidence, since there is always a certain risk connected with such things.

Mr. Andreotti has just referred to the fact that I told him that in the next few days, on Monday, Pavlov will deliver a report presenting the draft on destatification in the Supreme Soviet. This will be followed by an antimonopoly draft. And, for us this is a most urgent question. If we do not find an answer to the question of how to combat the super monopolies in our economy, then our market is doomed. And there are a number of others. I am not going to list all of them.

Thus, here we have all of the component parts. There are two major blocks of measures connected with the achievement of agreement and the radicalization of

economic reform. And, the second block is the preparation of all the prerequisites for developing cooperation with Western countries more confidently and on a larger scale. I think, you know, that you too have a feeling just like everyone in our country that something unexpected might burst out from this.

I think that there is no going back. We shall proceed along the path of transformations and one can get through the present course only by moving forward even more successfully. But, I think, that we have reached a pace which must not be exceeded. While proceeding with destatification and transferring to the market, we must not repeat what happened in our country during collectivization. People must not be forced into it. It is necessary to create all the conditions and prerequisites in order to give incentives for this process.

Well, a little about the situation in Yugoslavia. Yes, Chairman Andreotti and I had an exchange of opinions on this because we spoke about Europe, about everything positive that has been achieved and done here and about those points which cause disquiet and alarm. And within the framework of this we touched upon the situation in Yugoslavia. We express solidarity with all the forces of Yugoslavia which come out for the preservation of that state, which has made and is still making a serious contribution to the resolution not only of European problems but also of world problems, and in particular with regard to the Nonaligned Movement. Therefore, we expressed the hope that the present move towards a new quality of cooperation within the framework of the Yugoslav federation will be successfully completed. We take this close to our hearts, because it has something in common with our country.

But I must say that even after the meeting which we had quite recently—I spoke about this with Chairman Andreotti—you know that a centripetal process is appearing and increasing now in our country. In the course of the work on the anti-crisis program—the day before yesterday its final version was discussed and I once again chaired that meeting—representatives were present from all the republics, all of them, all of the republics. And some of them asked to have a conversation with me and I had conversations, even though brief ones, with representatives of Georgia, with representatives of Armenia, with representatives of Latvia, and with representatives of Lithuania. Now, yesterday, I received a telephone call, I was told about it, but I was unable to react to it. Comrade Ruutel, chairman of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian soviet socialist republic, was requesting a meeting.

In other words, a certain amount of experience and certain realities already exist which prompt us as to which direction we should be moving in. Therefore, I am sure, I think that we are now moving into the most acute period, but I am sure that society is coming to understand that we must preserve the integrity of this state which was formed over a thousand years.

[Ignatenko] This is the final question. [words indistinct] Women and children first.

[Unidentified correspondent] EL SOL, Spain. Mr. Andreotti, have the contradictions been overcome as far as concerns the interpretation of the treaty on conventional weapons? Mr. Gorbachev, Mr. Andreotti, is success being achieved in overcoming the disagreements with regard to the treaty on conventional weapons, and Mr. Gorbachev, also with regard to Boris Yeltsin?

[Andreotti] President Gorbachev has already said twice that during the present trip by the head of the Soviet armed forces to the United States it is hoped that success will be achieved in overcoming the final point of disagreement. I would like to add that it is a wish we hold in common that there should be once again the firm dialogue in the talks on problems of disarmament which led to the changing of the reference points in international policy. It is necessary to restore this climate and to resolve as soon as possible the problems of the interpretation of the already existing agreements and to move on to concluding new agreements.

[Gorbachev] I did not understand the question I was asked.

[Unidentified correspondent] A very short question. Mr. Gorbachev, do you trust Boris Yeltsin?

[Gorbachev] I think that in this case it is necessary in the first instance to speak about responsibility. The present situation in society and the problems and major tasks which are facing us dictate and insistently dictate that all politicians should adopt a specific manner of acting toward each other. I think that the appearance of the statement by the leaders of nine republics and the president of the USSR was precisely the result of the fact that this is now understood. And this is very important. For it is a matter of major politics, since it touches upon the interests of millions of people and, moreover, of a country which is in the stage of deep-going changes.

In any case, with all the diversity in the estimates of this statement, the fact that the overwhelming majority of the country's population supports this statement nevertheless prevails in our society. This is first. And second, all the participants in this meeting—in one form or the other and with all the nuances—considered it necessary to declare their support for this general position and declare that they will be following the requirements and the logic of this document. This will determine a lot of things. And now I should like to say this. Since the pre-election campaign here for the post of the president of the Russian Federation is getting into its decisive phase, let us not interfere with the pre-election campaign. Because I would then be expressing my preference for one candidate and leaving others without it. Let us wish them success in their campaign, let their programs compete, and let us leave them to prove to the working people of the Russian Federation which one of them is more deserving. Thank you.

[Ignatenko] Ladies and gentlemen, esteemed comrades, the short working visit of Giulio Andreotti, prime minister of the Italian Republic, to our country will finish very shortly. Let me thank him and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on your behalf for this news conference. Thank you.

[Gorbachev] Goodbye.

Talks With Pavlov

LD2205194891 Moscow TASS in English 1828 GMT
22 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 22 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov today met his Italian counterpart Giulio Andreotti.

Pavlov familiarised Andreotti with the current political and economic situation in the Soviet Union.

They noted particular importance of new forms of cooperation, mutual participation in joint-stock capital and improvement of the situation on the consumer market.

On behalf of the Italian leadership, Andreotti confirmed support to deep changes in the Soviet Union and readiness to promote their success.

The sides praised the state and character of Soviet-Italian relations boosted by the treaty on friendship and cooperation, signed in November 1990.

They said they were satisfied with the fact that despite the complex situation in recent years, economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Italy has successfully developed. They confirmed mutual interest in its further development.

In a businesslike manner, they discussed implementing major projects and coordinated possible ways for overcoming objective and subjective difficulties.

The sides agreed that the solution of the problems is important both for successful development of Soviet-Italian relations and for the Soviet Union's full and equal inclusion in the world economic system.

Concludes Visit, Departs

LD2205220991 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program
Radio-1 Network in Russian 1900 GMT 22 May 91

[Excerpts] USSR President Gorbachev and Italian Prime Minister Andreotti met in Moscow today to discuss major issues of the present situation and the role of the Soviet-Italian cooperation in tackling these issues. [passage omitted]

On Wednesday Giulio Andreotti left for home.

Gorbachev-Andreotti Talks Viewed

OW2405050891 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1800 GMT 23 May 91

[Article by "Diplomatic Panorama" correspondent Mikhail Mayorov: "Soviet-Italian Relations: Those of Allies?"—INTERFAX headline]

[Text] The May 22 Moscow talks between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Italian Premier Giulio Andreotti clearly demonstrated the two countries' determination to impart an essentially new quality to their bilateral relations. Commenting on this point in an interview with DP [Diplomatic Panorama], Petr Startsev of the USSR Foreign Ministry's First European Department mentioned a "growth of quantitative indicators" in Soviet-Italian contacts, which he said was preparing a shift from mutual understanding to practical cooperation as a guarantee of new-style bilateral relations.

The Soviet diplomat said Italy's President Francesco Cossiga had found a good verbal formula for this new trend, saying that relations between our two countries, of which one belongs to the Western and the other to the Eastern system, have been increasingly reminiscent of relations between two allied nations. The trend, according to Mr. Startsev, has already been formalized in the treaty of friendship and cooperation signed by the USSR and Italy last November—the first such treaty concluded between a Western and an Eastern state.

Mr. Andreotti's visit to the Soviet Union has not yielded any new bilateral agreements in economy or trade, which Mr. Startsev finds quite natural: He believes the legal basis for the two countries' relations is quite solid as it were, there existing a whole package of agreements in this area. The present task, according to the Soviet diplomat, is not so much to conclude new agreements as to get practical action on the already existing ones, primarily in what concerns getting Italian firms to finance Soviet reforms.

Asked whether Gorbachev and Andreotti had discussed the Soviet Union's possible participation in G7's London conference in July, Mr. Startsev said they had given it a "detailed study," since it was a question "vital to both the USSR and the G7 nations." The diplomat said the basic idea was "to get the Soviet Union more fully integrated into the international economic structures, which would meet the interests of both East and West." Although "other G7 countries may be thinking differently," Italy, according to Mr. Andreotti, would welcome the USSR's participation in the summit conference in London, Mr. Startsev said.

The Soviet president and the Italian premier are reported to have given due attention to the package of Middle East problems which, according to Startsev, is "a traditional topic for discussion by Moscow and Rome" and one of the subjects of the regular consultations held

with the Italian leadership by a member of the USSR Security Council, Yevgeniy Primakov. The situation in the Middle East and Mediterranean equally affects the security interests of Italy and the Soviet Union, causing the two nations to invigorate their interaction in this area and hold meetings of yesterday's kind. Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Andreotti focused on May 22 on the prospects for holding a conference on security and cooperation in the Mediterranean and considered a number

of Middle East problems. According to Mr. Startsev, they "strengthened mutual understanding on some points agreed upon earlier."

The Italian leader praised the USSR for promoting contacts with the Vatican. He said Italy was viewing it as a sign of positive change in the Soviet Union's foreign policy and in its attitude to the believers.

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet Promulgates Security Bodies Law

LD2305194491 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1736 GMT 23 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 23 May (TASS)—The following is the text of the USSR Supreme Soviet's decision promulgating the USSR law "On the State Security Bodies in the USSR":

The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To give effect to the USSR law "On the State Security Bodies in the USSR" from the moment of its publication.

2. Until the legislation of the USSR and the republics is brought into line with the USSR law "On the State Security Bodies in the USSR," the legislative enactments relating to the activities of the state security bodies are to be applied insofar as they do not contradict the aforementioned law. USSR Government decisions issued prior to the promulgation of the given law on matters that, in accordance with the law, may be regulated only by legislative enactments remain operative until the adoption of the relevant legislative enactments.

3. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers is to draw up and, in accordance with established procedure, submit for consideration by a routine session of the USSR Supreme Soviet:

- proposals for bringing current USSR legislative enactments into line with the USSR legislative enactments: on state, official, and commercial secrets; on the powers of the state security bodies regarding the application of administrative measures; on the legal protection of operatives of the state security bodies.

4. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers is to:

- ratify the statute on the USSR Committee for State Security before 1 January 1992 and to adopt other necessary normative enactments on matters transferred by the USSR Law "On the State Security Bodies in the USSR" to the jurisdiction of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers;

- bring USSR Government decisions and directives into line with the aforementioned law in the course of 1991-1992 and to ensure that departmental enforceable enactments that run counter to that law are reviewed by the USSR Committee for State Security.

5. The supreme soviets of the republics are to be instructed to bring republican legislation into line with the USSR law "On the State Security Bodies in the USSR".

6. The USSR Committee for State Security is, within a period of two months, to consider proposals from USSR people's deputies for improving the activities of the state

security bodies and, bearing them in mind, to draw up and adopt the necessary measures.

7. The USSR Supreme Soviet's Committee for Defense and State Security Issues is to ensure supervision over the implementation of the USSR law "On the State Security Bodies in the USSR" and of the present decision, and also over the drawing up of legally binding enactments in accordance with a list submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet by the USSR Cabinet of ministers.

[Signed] A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet

The Kremlin, Moscow, 16 May 1991.

Index-Linked Incomes Bill Faces Criticism

LD2305195891 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT
23 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—Several committees and commissions of the Soviet parliament today discussed draft fundamental of legislation of the Soviet Union and republics on indexing incomes of the population. The Soviet parliament is expected to have the first reading of the draft on May 28.

Submitting the draft, Soviet Labour and Social Issues Minister Valeriy Paulman said the government is planning to index incomes once in three months on the basis of a consumer price index.

According to the draft, only pensions, social allowances, grants and wages [words indistinct] organisations will be indexed. All other people will have to resolve issues concerning increasing their incomes through collective agreements with their administration.

"The government believes that wages should not increase automatically, but correspondingly with labour productivity and quality," Paulman said. "Indexing for all the working population could lead only to unleashing inflation," he said.

Far from all deputies agreed with the government's point of view. Member of the parliamentary commission for industry Nina Piryazeva said the system of collective agreements proposed by the government, is hardly real in conditions of shortages of money at enterprises.

This would result in many people staying without compensation. It is evident that during the first reading of the draft, the number of critics of the government's approach to indexing might grow, and long and difficult debates will follow.

Supreme Soviet Aide Comments on Exit, Entry Law*PM2305122991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
22 May 91 Second Edition p 2*

[G. Galey report: "Right of Exit"]

[Text] Moscow—The USSR Supreme Soviet has adopted a USSR Law "On the Procedure for USSR Citizens to Exit and Enter the Union of Soviet and Socialist Republics"

We asked V. Mironenko, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, for a comment on the adopted law.

"The interest shown by our own and the foreign media in the fate of this law is understandable," he said. "There have been many articles on this theme. Unfortunately, not all of them have been sufficiently accurate. From jokes on the subject of the legislator's indecisiveness and sluggishness last week to Tuesday's triumphant communique—such is their range.

"I want to warn PRAVDA readers straightaway against seeking to immediately exercise the right enshrined in the law by heading straight for the Visa and Registration Department for a foreign passport. The law only comes fully into force 1 January 1993. This decision was taken by the Supreme Soviet. Indeed, the difficulties—real and imagined—of bringing the law into force were the reason for its agonizing passage through the Supreme Soviet.

"What does the law offer our country's citizens which is new? It creates the legal conditions for each citizen to exercise his inherent right to leave the USSR and return to his native land, and provides for the possibility of giving each individual a foreign passport, which replaces the agonizing and often humiliating procedure for getting permission to leave which had become the norm for us. It also abolishes the unjust restrictions which used to plague any journey abroad. Exit will cease to be a privilege and will become a right, albeit a fairly expensive right once due account is taken of state tariffs, the rising price of tickets, and so on.

"The law fixes instances of provisional restrictions on the citizen's right to leave the USSR and the procedure for appealing against a refusal to issue a foreign passport. In particular I want to stress: Grounds for restricting a citizen's right to leave are clearly defined in article 7 of the law and will be made known to everyone when it is published. By the same token, this is the beginning of the end of departmental arbitrariness in deciding this issue."

In conclusion, Mironenko said: "The new law's adoption is one more step, and a large step, along the road to guaranteeing citizens' rights in our country. But, as the discussion on the law showed, this road will be difficult and long."

Hero of Socialist Labor Award To Be Abolished*LD2305223691 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 2130 GMT 23 May 91*

[From the "Vremya News Service" program]

[Text] The Union parliamentary commission for investigating special privileges is working on the decision to abolish the title, Hero of Socialist Labor. The reason for this is the excessive privileges for those in possession of the star for labor. I should like to remind you that since this decoration was introduced in 1938 it has been awarded to 20,000 people, and the first heroes of labor were Stalin and Beria.

Political & Social**Deputies Launch 'Movement of Constructive Forces'***PM2305140391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 May 91 Union Edition p 3*

[Open letter from USSR, RSFSR, and Moscow City Soviet deputies: "For Cooperation Among Constructive Forces"]

[Text] Esteemed fellow citizens!

Not for the first time our country is attempting to become a rule-of-law state, based on the traditions of parliamentary democracy. Unfortunately, previous attempts, going back to the reformist activities of Alexander I, Alexander II, and P.A. Stolypin and through February 1917, were abandoned for a long time, primarily through the actions of extreme radical forces. The adventurism and radicalism of the leadership, relying on the intolerance of significant strata of the people, subsequently played on more than one occasion a tragic role in our history (collectivization and the axing of the new economic policy, mass repression). On the other hand, extreme conservatives deftly exploited the intelligentsia's impatience, provoking N.S. Khrushchev's departure from the course of reforms. Having ensured his isolation, they then effected a "palace revolution" with ease and plunged the country into an era of stagnation.

Today's democracy is in its infancy. It is only two years old—too young to be able to survive without the support of the general public. By demonstrating club law and dictating to the entire country whether its democratically formed soviets and other organs of power should exist or not, the participants in political strikes and various unconstitutional actions are destroying the tender shoots of democracy in the people's as yet unformed political consciousness. It is our duty to keep society on the path of democratic development. Are we again going to allow the country to sink into a state of arbitrary rule, chaos, and disintegration? Will we again be unable to realize the opportunity of constitutional, democratic development for our state, unable to prevent it from heading straight for the clutches of a new totalitarianism?

To prevent this tragic development of events, we, the undersigned, urge all who reject right- and left-wing extremism and radicalism and the populism that goes with them to unite in a movement of constructive forces. The movement's chief task would be constructive actions to stabilize the political and economic situation and reform the country. We reject the "raze to the ground" principle, whose implementation has brought our people untold trouble and in recent years has been one cause of the crisis. The destruction of existing managerial mechanisms and economic structures cannot be allowed until alternatives have been created and tested. Rejecting unconstitutional methods of political pressure and all forms of extremism, we adopt a firm stance of protecting the rights of citizens of all nationalities, religions, and political beliefs.

We are proposing that both individual citizens, regardless of what party they belong to, and parties, unions, and all public associations should join the movement while retaining their internal structures, programs, statutes, and freedom of action (irrespective of the agreed position in each specific instance).

We hope that this appeal will strike a chord with all those who are not indifferent to the fate of present and future generations of the peoples of our country.

USSR People's Deputies T.G. Avaliani, I.A. Andreyeva, V.N. Belyayev, V.A. Volkov, V.I. Ginzburg, B.A. Gubarev, A.A. Denisov, A.G. Zhuravlev, T.K. Ismailov, N.V. Karlov, A.N. Krayko, D.N. Kugultinov, V.A. Leonchev, V.I. Lisitskiy, N.M. Mgaloblishvili, M.S. Minasbekyan, A.F. Nazarenko, S.Kh. Negmatullayev, N.N. Palytyshev, V.S. Podziruk, V.M. Ryabkov, D.G. Smirnov, O.O. Suleymenov, R.A. Ubaydullayeva, A.V. Tsalko, V.A. Tsyurupa, Yu.K. Sharipov, and V.A. Shekhovtsov; Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputies S.N. Baburin, L.Kh. Bakhtiyarova, N.T. Vedernikov, V.A. Byucheykiy, V.P. Lisin, O.Ye. Nifantsev, N.A. Pavlov, V.S. Revyakin, V.A. Serdyukov, V.A. Tikhonov, and I.A. Shashviashvili, and Moscow City Soviet people's deputies A.S. Zhukov, I.E. Krugovyykh, and A.N. Semenetskiy.

'Consensus' Association of Deputies' Groups Formed

PM2305153991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 May 91 Union Edition p 3

["Appeal for a 'Consensus' Association of Groups of USSR People's Deputies"—IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] Dear compatriots!

Our country, possessor of immense material and labor resources and intellectual potential, is being increasingly drawn into a deepening economic and political crisis and confrontation.

At the same time, the activities of various parties, movements, currents, organizations, and groups, most of which are sincerely striving to help society get out of that

state, sometimes objectively lead to the further destabilization of the situation in the country because of a lack of experience, proper responsibility, and analysis of the current state of affairs. In so doing you lose what is most important: Time, time, and more time. This is utterly unfair with regard to the people and their difficulties, concerns, hopes, and aspirations.

We are deeply convinced of the need for fundamental reforms, convinced that they must rule out administrative edict methods and apparatus crash-program approaches to the building of a democratic, fully-fledged market economy and stable rule-of-law society which actually is dedicated to universal human values, a society in which the priority of human rights is not only declared, but is reliably protected, and the people's desire for the revival or establishment of ethnic statehood and the right of nations to self-determination will not create insuperable barriers between them. Therefore, it is the sacred duty of people's deputies to ensure political leadership of the country in accordance with the will of the people.

The view in society now is that the crisis can only be resolved if all its constructive forces and movements consolidate. So it appears that our country now has its last chance of reviving hope. We will have no excuse to offer to history if we miss the opportunity. People's deputies, of all people, should set an example and take specific steps in that direction.

To that end the representatives of a number of groups of USSR people's deputies have announced the creation of a "Consensus" ["Soglasie"] Association of Groups of USSR People's Deputies, headed by a Coalition Coordinating Council, and urge the people's deputies of republics and local soviets to set up their own similar associations. Let us set aside our differences for a while and make a joint effort to get the country out of the impasse.

At the same time, it is perfectly clear that the goal will not be attained without the people's support. Therefore, all people's deputies who share our view should also set up "Consensus" groups among their voters in their own districts or public organizations, which will actively participate in all matters, from the elaboration of a program right through to its implementation.

In order to take specific steps in this direction it is proposed:

1. That a political platform be elaborated and published as soon as possible, taking into account the opinions of all "Consensus" associations and groups. It will be determined by universal human values and the supreme interests of society, not by individuals' ideological aims. It will envisage support for the Program to Resolve the Economic Crisis and social protection for citizens.

2. That the members of the "Consensus" Association, particularly those on its Coalition Coordinating Councils, be guided in their practical activities by the Association's political platform, and not by sundry parties', organizations', and movements' ideological aims which contradict it.

3. That interparliamentary groups be sent on mediation missions to all the country's "hot spots" to settle conflicts.

4. That the maximum reduction of mass measures be sought at Union and local levels. The country must achieve a labor rhythm that no one will disrupt.

Obviously it is these and similar emergency measures that can actually ensure political stability in society as an essential condition of resolving the economic crisis, rather than the introduction of a countrywide state of emergency.

[Signed] M.S. Minasbekyan and I.A. Andreyeva, "Justice"; V.I. Lisitskiy and M.R. Mamedov, "For Constructive Collaboration"; A.I. Volskiy, A.P. Vladislavlev, and A.V. Reshetnikova, "Scientific-Industrial"; D.N. Kugultinov and Yu.K. Sharipov, "Autonomous Entities"; V.S. Bolbasov and N.E. Ternyuk, "Promoting Scientific-Technical Progress"; F.M. Burlatskiy and P.G. Bunich, "Democratic Reforms"; A.A. Kiselev, S.F. Kalashnikov, and I.V. Ablameyko, "Young Deputies"; V.I. Kirillov, V.A. Voblikov, and A.N. Kuzmin, "Interregional Deputies' Group"; A.F. Veprev and N.V. Lemesheva, "Agrarian"; V.A. Leonchev, "Workers' Group"; Ye.D. Aypin and S.Ya. Palchin, "Assembly of People's Deputies from Small Peoples in the North, Siberia, and the Far East"; V.V. Yakushkin, "Internationalist Troops"; V.M. Falin and A.A. Denisov, "Communists' Group"; Yu.Yu. Sokolova and V.I. Semenko, "Life Group"; P.D. Osipov and G.A. Komarov, "Ecological Deputies' Group"; V.S. Podzirik, "For Radical Military Reform"; V.I. Stelmashonok and G.A. Chernykh, "On Questions of Cultural Development."

Bunich Claims Majority for 'Progressive Reforms'

PM2405081191 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No. 18, 5 May 91 p 1

[Interview with Pavel Bunich, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Economic Reform and chairman of the Union of USSR Leaseholders and Entrepreneurs, by correspondent Viktor Loshak; date and place not stated: "The Threat to the Reforms Is Serious"]

[Text] The creation of a bloc of deputies' groups under the provisional name "For Progressive Reforms" was announced in the Supreme Soviet last week. Our correspondent Viktor Loshak talks with one of its initiators, Pavel Bunich, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Economic Reform and chairman of the USSR Union of Leaseholders and Entrepreneurs.

[Bunich] Above all, the attacks by conservatives and the constant threat of a right-wing coup are forcing all healthy forces to consolidate. We would like to unite within the body of deputies not only those customarily called democrats, the left wing, and so on but everyone who does not deny the importance of economic reforms above all as the path to overcoming the crisis. Many groups in the Supreme Soviet answered our appeal: groups uniting young people, the scientific and industrial group, agrarians, those in favor of military and democratic reforms, ecologists, the interregional deputies' group...

[Loshak] Isn't it too late? Won't this prove to be the habitual limp response by the intelligentsia to the consolidation of right-wing forces—from a Russian Communist Party moving onto the offensive to "Soyuz," whose demands for a state of emergency and a return to the past, so to speak, are reinforced now by economic conditions?

[Bunich] Indeed, "Soyuz" unites around 600 people, and there must be something to counter their undemocratic demands (although a section of the group has already dissociated itself from the totalitarian policy—a letter with 22 signatures was read out at the Supreme Soviet). I don't believe that the day is ultimately lost. Although the conservatives' offensive mood was clear to me at the last CPSU Central Committee plenum, I am convinced that there is no cause for panic. After all, the plenum brought together not just the conservatives but also, on the other side, people holding what seem to me to be commonsense positions. After Gorbachev's statement about his possible resignation as general secretary a group of plenum participants (Zhurkin, Volskiy, Nazarbayev, Martynov, Bunich—72 people in all) drew up a letter to the plenum which basically said: If Gorbachev goes, we will leave the Central Committee too.

[Loshak] In your opinion, how many deputies will it be possible to unite behind the idea of progressive reforms?

[Bunich] Considerably more than behind the ideas of anti-democracy, I think.

'Soyuz' Spokesman Kim Denies Charges of Extremism

PM2405090091 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 May 91 First Edition p 1

[Interview with Ye. Kim, member of the presidium of the "Soyuz" Deputies Group, by S. Karkhanin under the rubric "Debates in the Kremlin"; date, place of interview not stated: "Vector of Stability"]

[Text] According to the timetable for the USSR Supreme Soviet, on 21 May the session participants will begin debates on the draft new Union Treaty. What will be the stance of the "Soyuz" Deputies' Group, one of the largest and most authoritative groups in parliament? "Soyuz" has recently come under severe critical attacks from the "democrats," but it is still pursuing a thoughtful and constructive political line. Ye. Kim,

member of the presidium of the deputies' group and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for State Building, explains:

[Kim] First, I must remind you that after meeting with N.I. Ryzhkov our group decided to support his candidacy in the Russian presidential election. Nikolay Ivanovich is a committed supporter of a renewed Union within the present borders, and moreover he is a sober-minded politician who realizes how dangerous it is to try to introduce autonomy for the republics on the spur of the moment.

Let me add that under the established state structure the Ministries of Defense and Foreign and Internal Affairs, as well as the KGB, were basically not subordinate to the chairman of the Council of Ministers, which means that he cannot bear full responsibility for their mistakes. Furthermore we know that N.I. Ryzhkov spoke out against the "excesses" of the antialcohol campaign and a number of other decisions which later proved to be mistakes, but his voice was not heard at the time...

Our group unites those who support the idea of a reformed Union, but in other respects our positions do not always coincide. There are supporters of moderate and extreme views. That is doubtless only natural. But the position of particular "Soyuz" activists should not be confused with the position of the group as a whole. Although precisely this kind of confusion, accidentally or deliberately, has formed the basis of sharp criticism against us in, for instance, IZVESTIYA. The author of the article "'Soyuz' of Obsessives" accused us of ambition, extremism, adventurism, and other mortal sins... But he is a long way from the truth.

Not all the cochairmen of the all-Union deputies' association "Soyuz" belong to the "Soyuz" group of USSR people's deputies. And, most important, the group has never once supported calls for excessively tough measures, bordering on ultimatums.

One reproach leveled against us is that the group supposedly has no outstanding leaders. I would describe such attacks as "provincial syndrome." True, the majority of us are people from the periphery, so to speak. But do you absolutely have to be a Muscovite to think in a statesmanlike fashion? And there are many examples of deputies from our group holding very responsible state posts. B. Rakhimova recently became USSR deputy prime minister—surely that proves something?

O. Shenin, Yu. Blokhin, S. Shuvalov, G. Komarov... I could name many names. And as for our supporters outside the Kremlin, we are supported by all who clearly see the dangers of attempts to destroy the united Union: workers, peasants, the intelligentsia. And our opponents include those whom our strong united state does not suit, the supporters of capitalism run "wild"—I am talking about dishonest cooperative workers, underground millionaires, rogue politicians, and nationalist careerists. It is in their interests to split the country into petty principalities, where it will be easier to seize real power. Our

group is opposed to this, and it is not surprising that they attack it so fiercely, not shrinking from conjecture and distortion of the facts.

We are in favor of the transition to the market, but not the abandonment of the planned economy and social protection of the poorly off, although we should not, of course, encourage idlers and loafers. Here everything should be regulated by carefully considered legislation. In particular, we are convinced that prices for basic food products cannot yet be deregulated: Such a step would push millions of people below the poverty line.

Our group has representatives of virtually all the republics, and we intend to participate actively in debates on the draft Union Treaty. We will insist that if the state is to remain federal, the center should not be deprived of power. There should also be a Union tax and an integrated transportation system.

Gorbachev Meets Georgian Representative in Moscow

LD2305220291 Moscow Radio Rossi Network
in Russian 2050 GMT 23 May 91

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev met Nadar (?Midzumarashvili), the permanent representative of Georgia, in Moscow today. Details of negotiations between the USSR president and Zviad Gamsakhurdia, the Georgian leader, were discussed. According to Russian News Agency information, an agreement, in principle, has been concluded on staging a meeting between them in Moscow, though the precise date for the meeting has not yet been decided.

Gorbachev Attends Leaseholders Congress

LD2405085491 Moscow TASS in English 0822 GMT
24 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 24 TASS—The second congress of USSR lease-holders and entrepreneurs opened in the House of Trade Unions in Moscow today. President Mikhail Gorbachev is attending the congress's morning session.

Pavel Bunich, president of the Union of Lease-holders and Entrepreneurs, delivered a report on the results of work in the past 12 months and prospects for the development of the movement.

Secretary Luchinskiy Visits Komsomol Offices

PM2305094791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 22 May 91 p 1

[Report: "Meeting Held"]

[Text] There was a time when the secretaries of both the party Central Committee and the Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League] Central Committee were accommodated in the same building. They dropped in on one another without warning, drank tea, and addressed each other informally. Then the two Central

Committees divided up the accommodation, across which a path was stamped out on which there was one-way traffic: from the small block to the big block. Komsomol members would hurry over for a dressing-down, for a valuable instruction, or even for party work.

Today the situation is changing. The Komsomol is becoming a different organization, one more independent in its actions and decisions. While even the party Central Committee leadership, it seems, is becoming familiar with the path into the Komsomol's quarters.

Yesterday P.K. Luchinskiy, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, came to the Komsomol Central Committee for a meeting with the members of its Bureau.

The conversation was conducted in the spirit of the times—not especially cheerfully—about matters of concern to everyone. About the values and the role of the ruling party, about the catering in student canteens and strikes, and about democrats and conservatives. Finally, about the need to search for consensus. A special topic was the relations of party and Komsomol committees in the localities. And of course, the Komsomol press—but this time, it is true, mostly about how to help it survive.

Ministers Increase Compensation for Miners

LD2305155591 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1900 GMT 22 May 91

[Text] With the aim of increasing the social protection of the population, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has adopted a decision which provides for an increase in the minimum compensation payments to workers in underground and open-cast mining, metallurgical, and other branches of the national economy, and establish them on a differential scale. Enterprises, associations, and organizations are recommended, in addition to increasing salaries, to send additional money for increasing payments connected with the provision of social and labor privileges, including compensation for the increase in food prices in canteens, buffets, and dispensaries and also in children's hospitals, kindergartens, and pioneer and health camps. The decision will be published in full in the press.

Republic Procurators Attend Procuracy Session

LD2205111191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1827 GMT 21 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 21 May (TASS)—The procurators of the union republics attended a sitting today of the USSR Procuracy Collegium for the first time as members.

The new position of procurators of the union republics, the change in the functions of the USSR Procuracy, and the correlation of the powers of central and republican procuratorial bodies—all these constituted the central questions on which the speakers' attention was concentrated. The collegium demanded that procurators erect a reliable barrier against the "norm-production" of any

bodies of officials that distort the law, hinder the establishment of new economic relations and onward progress toward the building of a rule-of-law state, and assume powers that do not belong to them and which harm the rights and interests of citizens and organizations.

It was recommended that top priority be given to the correct execution of anti-crisis norms and of the laws on ownership, land, cooperatives, and the basic principles of enterprise and price-setting, and to observance of legality in the foreign economic activity of enterprises and organizations. The following task was set: by making full use of the unity of the procuracy system and the powers available to the USSR procurator general and the procurators of the union republics, to keep a constant watch to ensure that cases of abuse, theft, bribe-taking, creation of illegal channels for providing finance and for distributing material, monetary and foreign-currency resources, and production of artificial shortages, as well as instances of corruption, extortion, and other criminal, mercenary phenomena, are investigated legally by the monitoring bodies, services combatting the embezzlement of socialist property and speculation, the KGB, and the procuracy itself.

The task has been set to raise the level of supervision of the observance of laws in the activities of all, without exception, political parties and mass public associations and movements. If unlawful actions are committed by their leading bodies or members, procurators must issue official warnings and prosecute those guilty and, when necessary, raise in court the question of their elimination in accordance with the law.

After a break at a joint session of the collegiums of the USSR Procuracy and USSR State Arbitration, consideration was given to the question of cooperation between these bodies to prevent violations of legislation in economic relations during the period of the implementation of the anti-crisis program.

Editors, Publishers Protest Price Increases

PM2305113591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 May 91 Second Edition p 1

[Undated letter to President M.S. Gorbachev from newspaper editors and publishing house directors: "The Subscriber Must Not Suffer"]

[Text] To Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR

Esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich!

The continuing growth in the prices and tariffs for paper, communications services, and transportation is forcing the publishing houses and editorial boards of periodicals to increase the cost of newspapers and journals. Thus, last year their prices doubled. Now, on the threshold of the subscription campaign, publishing houses and editorial boards have been notified by the USSR Ministry of Communications of a new, approximately twofold,

increase in the cost of services relating to the dispatch and delivery of the periodical press. A further 50-percent increase in the cost of paper is planned.

In this situation publishing houses have been forced once again to raise the prices of the periodical press by at least 50 to 100 percent. We realize that this will displease readers, lead to a drop in circulation, and limit the impact of the press on the social development of society.

Receiving money from the subscriber in advance, a publishing house is not in a position to absorb all the additional costs stemming from the change in the prices of materials and services during the year. As a result, we will essentially deceive millions of readers who, by subscribing to particular publications at the beginning of the year, give us a kind of advance. It will turn out that we will violate the reciprocal contract concluded by us with many millions of subscribers. Can this be considered normal? Can such a situation be accepted and tolerated? We think not!

We are convinced that the subscriber must in no way suffer from the increase in the prices of services, paper, and other materials which might happen during the year. It is necessary to protect the subscriber and the reader of our press from all kinds of price fluctuations—otherwise he might end up in a very complex position. What will suffer in the end will be glasnost, which is rightly acknowledged as one of the most important gains of perestroika.

In order to prevent this we ask for a presidential decree to entrust the Cabinet of Ministers with establishing firm fixed prices for paper and communications services and transportation charges connected with the production and delivery to readers of the periodical press. If the event that these prices exceed the set ones, then in our opinion it is necessary to subsidize the sectors out of the state budget, as is customary in all civilized countries. We also propose to entrust the USSR Cabinet of Ministers with establishing a preferential system of taxation of the periodical press and of publishing activity associated with its production.

Please consider all this the voice not only of journalists and publishers but also of the huge mass of our country's readers, who do not want glasnost to perish beneath the impossible burden weighing down upon it.

I. Frolov, chief editor of PRAVDA

N. Yefimov, chief editor of IZVESTIYA

A. Potapov, chief editor of TRUD

V. Leontyev, director of the "PRAVDA" Publishing House

Yu. Yefremov, director of the "IZVESTIYA" Publishing House

Poll Shows Fewer Favor Authoritarian Solutions

PM2405085791 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI
in Russian No. 18, 5 May 91 p 5

[Public Opinion Poll by "Working Group of the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion" published under "Social Barometer" rubric; first paragraph is unattributed introduction: "How Will Events Turn Out?"]

[Text] Below are the results of polls carried out by the All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion (VTsIOM) in January and April 1991 on the subject of the all-Union representative elections. Each poll embraced the views of over 2,000 people in 33 cities and 17 rural rayons on the territory of 11 republics (Russia, the Ukraine, Lithuania, Belorussia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan). The statistics are in percentages.

IN YOUR OPINION, WHAT CHANGES IN POLITICAL LIFE CAN THE SOVIET UNION EXPECT THIS YEAR?

Agreement will be reached among the various political forces	10
Dictatorship will be established	11
Civil war will break out	16
The Union will collapse	20
I think that everything will stay the way it is now	29
I find it hard to say	27
(When answering this question it was possible to choose several options, so the total number of answers may exceed 100 percent.)	

HOW WOULD YOU REACT IF, IN VIEW OF THE EXACERBATION OF THE POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC SITUATION IN THE COUNTRY: ALL RALLIES AND DEMONSTRATIONS WERE TEMPORARILY BANNED?

	January	April
Positively	42	31
Negatively	42	42
Cannot say definitely	16	27

ALL STRIKES WERE TEMPORARILY BANNED?

	January	April
Positively	50	38
Negatively	36	38
Cannot say definitely	14	24

THE ACTIVITIES OF THE UNION AND REPUBLIC SUPREME SOVIETS WERE SUSPENDED AND ABSOLUTE POWER WERE GIVEN TO THE PRESIDENT?

	January	April
Positively	16	11
Negatively	65	59
Cannot say definitely	19	30

THE POST OF USSR PRESIDENT WERE ABOLISHED AND ABSOLUTE POWER GIVEN TO A COUNCIL OF REPUBLIC LEADERS?

Positively	45
Negatively	19
Cannot say definitely	36

[signed] VTsIOM Working Group

Spokesman on New Exit Law, Emigration Figures

LD2405033991 Moscow TASS in English 1612 GMT 23 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—The Soviet law on the procedure of exit from and entry to the Soviet Union, recently passed by the Soviet parliament, is "an important step towards democratisation of Soviet society," head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's humanitarian cooperation and human rights directorate Yuriy Reshetov said today.

Reshetov and head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's visas and permissions directorate Rudolf Kuznetsov were addressing a news conference here today.

The adoption of the law will favorably affect the development of trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and other countries, Reshetov said.

"It was not passed because of some immediate foreign political motives, but because it will ensure one of the main human rights to Soviet people and make Soviet society completely open, which is one of the main conditions for perestroika in the economic sphere," Reshetov said.

The law will help retain and strengthen the all-Union legal space and counter separatist centrifugal trends, he said. Reshetov noted that the country's highest political leadership helped promote the adoption of the law.

Reshetov briefly familiarised correspondents with the main provisions of the law. He especially noted that a strict list for limits on exit has been adopted. Citizens can apply to court, if they disagree with decisions limiting their right to leave the country.

According to estimates, some 500,000 people can leave the Soviet Union every year, but part of them will return. Some estimates show that influx of currency from such citizens can reach ten billion U.S. dollars a year, Reshetov said.

Since the adoption of the law, a person has the right to leave the country for permanent residence on the invitation of any relative or if a person produces permission for entry to a corresponding country, Reshetov said.

In addition, beginning on July 1, 1991, the Soviet parliament presidium decree dated 1967, stripping persons leaving for Israel of Soviet citizenship will be canceled. Both Israelis and Arabs insisted on repealing the decree, Reshetov said.

Asked if his personal interference was needed to issue visas to some participants in the Andrey Sakharov international congress, underway in Moscow, Reshetov said that all persons about whose applications he knew, received permissions for entry from corresponding Soviet bodies.

Reshetov confirmed that several people, who had been invited, were put on a blacklist. But "all these cases have been resolved, and we are planning to pursue the policy during other human rights actions." While there are several dozen such people on Soviet blacklists, U.S. authorities have included 300,000 people in similar lists, Reshetov said.

Kuznetsov said over 111,000 people, including children under age, have received permission to leave the Soviet Union over the first four months of 1991, somewhat less than in the same period of 1990.

The number of Soviet citizens, who have received permission to leave the country, but refused to do so, has grown by 500 per cent. The number of people wishing to leave for Greece has slashed by some 65 per cent and those wishing to leave along "the Israeli channel" by some 200 people, compared to the same period of 1990, Kuznetsov said.

Survey on Reasons for Emigration

OW2405051991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 23 May 91

[From "viewpoint"]

[Text] The news agency DATA continues reporting the findings of an opinion poll which the National Public Opinion Studies Center (VCIOM) has carried out to study a package of exit-related problems.

3,006 respondents representing a cross section of the Soviet Union's urban and rural population were asked to say why they would like to live abroad.

38% said they would live the way they liked in a foreign country.

24% said they wanted to live in a free society.

As many respondents were ready to move abroad because they feared a further deterioration of the economic crisis in the USSR.

16% of the people polled expressed fears about the future of their children.

10% said they were afraid the political situation here might worsen further.

5% said they felt insecure in the USSR—a feeling their relatives shared, too.

Only 1 percent said they wanted a reunion with their foreign-based relatives.

17% of the respondents failed to express a definite opinion.

The participants were invited to choose no more than 2 answers. The statistical error margin was set at 3 percent.

TASS Reviews Press for 24 May

LD2405065991 Moscow TASS in English 0622 GMT
24 May 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 24 TASS—Today's newspapers highlight the work of the Russian Congress of People's Deputies. On Thursday, the congress discussed the bill on amendments to the republican constitution in the wake of the creation of a new presidency.

Russian presidential candidates have begun campaigning, newspapers report. TRUD covers Nikolay Ryzhkov's meeting with electors. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA carries comments by Colonel General Albert Makashev. SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA publishes Vladimir Zhirinovskiy's platform.

PRAVDA publishes a full transcript of a joint press conference held by President Mikhail Gorbachev and Italian Prime Minister Giulio Andreotti on May 22.

Gorbachev described his talks with Andreotti as "important and useful."

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA publishes a Soviet bill on state security bodies and a parliamentary resolution on its implementation.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and PRAVDA highlight a festival of Slavic culture which opens in Smolensk today.

The event is attended by scholars and the literati from Italy, Germany, Austria, Greece, Bulgaria, Poland and Slovakia.

PRAVDA comments on the situation in the Soviet agroindustrial sector discussed at the recent meeting of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee commission on agrarian policy.

PRAVDA carries an interview with film director Karen Shakhnazarov about his new film "Regicide".

The picture tells about the killing of last Russian Tsar Nicholas the Second and his family.

Shakhnazarov said "the film is not about political problems. Its pathos is aimed against any form of violence."

TRUD comments on a lull in the fighting on the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA covers the call-up of Army conscripts in Tajikistan. The republic will meet its quota for conscripts, it says.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA publishes an address by participants in the first Army conference of soldiers-internationalists to troops.

"In complex domestic conditions, the Army remains a reliable guarantor of the Soviet Union's integrity, accord and peace and the stronghold of security," it says.

The state commission on problems facing Crimean Tatars met in Moscow on Thursday to discuss additional measures to protect Crimean Tatars returning to the Crimea, newspapers report.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA carries an interview with Chief of Soviet General Staff Mikhail Moiseyev, who comments on the results of his visit to the United States.

The talks were tough but useful. "I believe there are good prospects in many directions," Moiseyev told the newspaper on his flight back.

PRAVDA analyses Chinese reforms.

Newspapers describe preparations for the funeral of Rajiv Gandhi in India following his assassination on May 21.

Soviet ethnic strife and labour unrest hamper the country's cooperation with the West, international public information coordinator Sally Carry of the international association in support of perestroika writes in RAB-OCHAYA TRIBUNA.

Continuing labour unrest, protests and riots, and possibly a civil war, could lead to unpredictable consequences for the Soviet Union and other countries, she believes.

Comparison of Draft Income Indexation Plan

PM2005132191

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 18 May 1991 carries in its Second Edition on page 2 a TASS report on Gorbachev's presentation of a draft income indexation plan to the USSR Supreme Soviet. The PRAVDA item, entitled "Draft Presented," has been compared with the Moscow TASS International Russian version published in the 20 May Soviet Union DAILY REPORT on page 32, column 2, under the headline "Gorbachev Presents Draft Income Indexation Plan" revealing the following variations:

First paragraph, sentence one begins: [Text] USSR President Mikhail (deleting dateline, introductory words)

Paragraph two, sentence three reads: protection of citizens, primarily socially vulnerable (deleting "from")

Paragraph four, sentence one reads: The draft demarcates the competence of (changing "limits" to "demarcates")

Same paragraph, last sentence, to paragraph five, first sentence reads: ...the republican level. It is being established in particular that the consumer price index is calculated on the basis of a single methodology using a fixed basket of consumer goods and services which is to be adopted in the republics to calculate the minimum consumer budget, and reflects local features of consumption. [new paragraph] During the preparation.... (adding sentence)

Economic

Academic Ponders Economic Policy's Future

PM2305125191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 May 91 Second Edition p 2

["Subjective Remarks" article by Doctor of Economic Sciences A. Komin, datelined Moscow: "Prices Have Gone Up. What Next"]

[Text] The first and most difficult stage of the prices and service charges reform in the country is over. Following the introduction of new wholesale and purchasing prices, retail prices and service charges payable by the population were increased as of 2 April.

The reform was not unexpected. It had been the topic of discussion for five years now, the schedule for its implementation was extended. Nevertheless, no matter what preparations were being made for it, the level of food prices and especially of prices for nonfood goods came as a surprise for the overwhelming majority of the population. We wanted to avoid the "shock" therapy, but in essence ended up undergoing such a therapy.

It can be said that people were better prepared for a rise of retail prices for foodstuffs, which lately were being sold almost everywhere at contractual and commercial prices that were double or treble the current state prices, and at times even higher still. What was surprising was the level of prices for nonfood goods, primarily textiles, clothing, footwear, and other articles in daily demand. The population responded negatively to the higher prices for children's goods, even though this is perfectly easy to explain: The state abandoned subsidies for these goods when determining the new prices. Moreover, many children's goods were made of textiles that used to be supplied at discounts of up to 30 percent. The higher cost of cafeteria meals also produced a painful effect, although this came as no surprise either: The cost of foodstuffs increased, on average, by a factor of 2.5.

As conceived, the retail prices reform was meant to solve two main problems. The first was to introduce order in prices from the viewpoint of their economic justification and to abandon distorted prices that hindered the normal economic process and resulted in steadily rising

subsidies and state budget deficit. Naturally, a market economy could not have even been imagined if the old prices were to be maintained.

The second task being resolved consisted of ensuring that the retail prices reform promoted market stabilization to a certain extent. This meant that the population should have been only partially compensated for rising prices and a certain proportion of the additionally earned funds should have gone to reduce the budget deficit, curb the population's consumer demand, and consolidate the country's financial position.

There has been a lot of talk to the effect that the population must "pay" for the economy's extrication from the crisis, for the transition to the market, and so on. But so far people have not been told anything specific about the extent of the sacrifice or whose shoulders will have to bear the brunt of it. It is time to reveal the truth: How much, who, and for how long—then everyone will know. For the time being, however, bombastic resolutions are adopted for the sake of political games, proclaiming that the state must bear the brunt of difficulties associated with the transition to market relations. Claims that we can extricate ourselves from the situation without any loss at all are tantamount to claiming that we can swim without getting wet.

It must be bluntly said that the psychological factor was not fully taken into account during preparations for the reform. It could also be described as the "shock" factor. Its effect was that the setting up of a new system of prices, which increased by a factor of two, three, or more for foodstuffs and basic nonfood goods, and a comparison of this entire system against the amount of monthly compensation (60 rubles [R] per worker), gave the impression that the amount of compensation was extremely low and did not correspond with the publicized percentage of funds earmarked for its implementation. This is why the majority of the people do not believe to this day that the amount of money allocated for compensation is indeed almost identical to the sum total of retail price increases.

A straight calculation proves this. If the sum of R240 billion is divided by the number of the population and the result is further divided by 12 months, the monthly compensation amounts to R74.20. The explanation why workers were given R60 and pensioners R65 is that part of the funds was channeled into raising the wages of physicians, teachers, and cultural sphere workers. I would like to explain specifically that with the amount of R63 billion allocated for children, the monthly compensation norm per child amounts to about R75—more than per adult. This took into account the higher prices for children's goods.

Ultimately, the amount paid in compensation will equal the sum total of price increases and the state will gain no dividend from this increase. Part of the proceeds from higher prices will never reach the union, republic, or local budgets because it will be retained by enterprises to

cover the difference between costs and the old retail price, and the generation of necessary profits on products that were produced at a loss. There are quite a few such products—all foodstuffs and up to 70 percent of cultural, consumer, and domestic goods.

Matters would have been different if republic budgets had been drawn up taking all losses into account. Unfortunately, only 50 percent of losses were taken into account. Therefore, the budget shortfall will reach at least R50-60 billion, while compensation will have to be paid out in full. This presents an interesting picture. When the price increase was under preparation, all the republics were in favor and their top leaders—except B. Yeltsin—signed documents and even promised to offer material assistance to those who were short of funds to compensate the population for the higher prices. It now emerges that everyone is short of funds. The budgets—which never existed in reality—have virtually fallen apart. The resulting situation follows the principle of “each man for himself.” Everyone is trying to cover his own back. The single economic space, of which we are hearing so much, is simply not materializing.

The reform, although it was so long in the preparation stage, has numerous shortcomings. It must be admitted that the time picked for its implementation is not the best. The production of foodstuffs and nonfood goods alike is declining. Political and social tension in society is growing. And yet the retention of the old prices in conditions of total disorganization in the financial system and loss of control over wages would also have proved fatal for the economy. Such are our realities.

Taking all this into account, trading organizations were warned in good time not to hurry with the sale of goods stockpiled in stores and warehouses and to build up stocks of goods as much as possible before 2 April. But people at the local level made their own decisions: Strenuous efforts were made to sell off the diminished stocks before the introduction of the [new] prices. Huge lines of invitation shoppers formed outside Moscow's stores. In the country as a whole, sales during the first quarter were R26 billion higher than during the same period last year.

The question is: Was this stepped up sale of goods before the introduction of the new prices done arbitrarily or on somebody's instructions? It was obviously not to the economy's benefit and was even more obviously at odds with the reform. This is why the press carried, as if obeying someone's orders, reports headlined “There Are Prices, But There Are No Goods.” As if, in the crisis conditions, the introduction of new prices could have operated like a magic wand and saturated the market with goods.

No, the situation in the market will deteriorate further still if the results of strikes are taken into account. The miners' demands for higher wages, to which the government agreed although conditionally (subject to taking coal extraction up to 711 million tonnes), in reality gave

the green light to similar demands by other workers. Look no further than the strike by Minsk enterprises. It is evident that, as a result of this pressure, the presses will start printing “Mickey Mouse” money faster still. Amounts in excess of retail price increases will be paid out and the situation in the market may end up much worse.

This path is suicidal, it can only lead to a new reform of retail prices: By means of either a centralized increase or a transition to free contractual price formation, in other words the so-called liberalization. There can only be one result: Wages and price increases must in the end be brought in line with market demands. Demand and supply must be balanced. This is unavoidable. Unless it is done now, the difficulties in the future will be even greater.

The only way out of the crisis is to put an end to the wages race and bring prices in line with purchasing power. The people must be told this openly. As for those who are now agitating about further wages growth, they are pursuing a line of the economy's final destruction.

Whereas attempts were formerly made to thwart the reform by claims that it was not well timed and was even unnecessary, political demagogues today are wrecking it by screaming that it is unbearably heavy for the people who are in any case leading a worse life than anyone else in the world. There has been a resumption of quests for nonexistent reserves and attempts to divide the meager pie, which is in any case getting smaller due to declining output.

It is time to come to our senses—after all, in essence we are consuming the wealth left behind by our grandfathers and fathers and are even dipping into our children's and grandchildren's pockets. Generally speaking, we are living beyond our means. The amazing point is that this is not being realized not just by ordinary people but even by deputies at all levels who adopt laws increasing pensions, wages, and other supplementary material benefits that totally lack a realistic economic base today. This is downright waste of time and deceit!

The serious economic measures taken by the state and aimed at strengthening and stabilizing the economy cannot be turned into objects of political speculation and means for settling accounts in the struggle for power. It is time to abandon political wrangling and to think seriously about where we are going and what measures have to be urgently adopted.

Economic Crimes Continue To Increase

OW2205154591 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1230 GMT 21 May 91

[Text] Speaking at a briefing in Moscow on Tuesday, deputy chief of the USSR Interior Ministry's Main Department on Combating Thefts of Socialist Property, Colonel Viktor Abrasimov, said that with transition to

free market his department should be transformed into governmental service for dealing with economic crimes.

According to him, this would be quite natural, since in new circumstances, when many legislative provisions relating to private enterprise, profiteering and the handling of hard currency have been abolished, his department will have to abandon some of its functions, but take up new ones, connected primarily with monitoring the legitimacy of financial operations and crediting. The USSR Interior Ministry, V. Abrasimov told newsmen, submitted the necessary proposals to the USSR Council of Ministers.

In the meantime negative trends in the country's economy and social instability aggravated the situation in the consumer goods market in the first 4 months of the current year. According to the ministry, now the major abuses of law are endeavors to conceal goods and sell them illegally. Numerous abuses were registered in the area of industrial and agricultural production.

Widely spread are illegal operations with raw materials and consumer goods in the system of barter transactions and other external economic relations.

Moscow Starts To Sell Small Retail Outlets

*PM2305151791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 May 91 Union Edition p 1*

[RIA report from news agencies roundup: "Trade Privatization Has Begun"]

[Text] RIA reports that there is a proposal to hold an auction, at the beginning of June, in Moscow to sell off a number of trading points—about a dozen stalls, pavilions, and booths in the capital's Izmaylovskiy and Sokolnicheskiy parks. The opening price at the auction will be set by a valuation commission. An RIA reporter was informed of this by Moscow City Soviet Deputy Yuri Solomatin. According to him, a wider sell-off of small trading premises was checked by the absence of USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] legislation relating to the privatization of trading enterprises.

Share-Holding Operations to Increase

*OW2305031891 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1800 GMT 22 May 91*

[From "Exchange News"]

[Text] The Central Stock Exchange in Moscow reported that brokerage companies operating at the exchange have provided share-holding operations to as many as 15 plants and banks throughout the country in the past 12 months.

Exchange officials says share-holding operations will soon increase at least ten-fold to cover almost all sectors of the economy.

The Central Exchange also said that Frezer instrument manufacturers in Moscow issued a Rbl [Ruble] 4.5 million worth of shares for sale at yesterday's auction. Several joint ventures and private companies acquired a Rbl 1.5 million worth of shares at a quoted price. Brokers say these share prices are likely to be 10 percent up within the next few days.

Moscow's Central Stock Exchange was registered last November with an initial stock of Rbl 48 million. Among its founders are the Soviet Finance Ministry, the city authorities, commercial banks, state enterprises, joint ventures and cooperatives. The exchange has started holding daily auctions since March 22, 1991.

Russian Academy of Enterprise Begins Work

*LD2205110691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 2230 GMT 21 May 91*

[Text] The Russian Academy of Enterprise starts operating today. Its presentation will take place today and the first seminar will open in the building of the Central Interdepartmental Institute for Refresher Courses for Builders in Moscow. The Academy is a modern organization of the market economy. It unites the tasks of education, scientific research, commercial activity and legal protection with a view toward assisting everyone who wishes to embark on the path of civilized enterprise.

The organizers of the Russian Academy of Enterprise, among whom is the Scientific-Industrial Union of the Soviet Union, are setting themselves the aim not simply of teaching people commerce and making a fast buck, but to engage in serious, major programs that are of benefit to society.

Military

Yazov Addresses Service Veterans Conference

*LD2205215991 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 2010 GMT 22 May 91*

[Text] Moscow, 22 May (TASS)—The first all-army conference of internationalist servicemen of the USSR Armed Forces took place at the Central Academic Theater of the Soviet Army today. Addressing those who attended the meeting, Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitry Yazov, USSR minister of defense, said: "Although not at variance with the norms of international law, the introduction of the Soviet military contingent into Afghanistan has been officially recognized as a mistake. Taking into account the changed concrete historical circumstances, this is a just evaluation but the highest evaluation of the fighting activities and feats of the servicemen who fittingly fulfilled the military tasks of giving internationalist help to the friendly Afghan people is just, too."

All those who fulfilled their military duty with dignity and honor and lived through the severe school of war in

Afghanistan, Vietnam, Korea, and other countries, the minister said, have deserved nationwide respect, gratitude, and care.

He recalled that the 50th anniversary of the day when fascists invaded our country and the Great Patriotic War started would be marked in a month. By way of an unprecedented military and labor feat, through sacrifices and deprivations, Soviet people defended their native land and liberated the peoples of Europe from fascism. Friendship between our country's peoples was one of the life-giving sources of our victory, the minister stressed.

Wishing the internationalist servicemen good health and success, Dmitriy Yazov said that their toughness and military experience, and professional and moral qualities should stabilize society, cement the military ranks, and serve an example to new generations of internationalist patriots and reliable defenders of the homeland.

General Explains New Navy Volunteer Program

PM2105113991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
21 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[Interview with Major General V. Nikitin, USSR Armed Forces General Staff directorate department chief, by correspondent N. Buryga; first two paragraphs are introduction: "Volunteers Under Contract"]

[Text] As IZVESTIYA has already reported, a USSR Supreme Soviet resolution has made changes to the USSR Law "on universal military service." Henceforth the term of active military service is set at two years and for soldiers, sailors, sergeants, and petty officers with higher education one year.

Our correspondent talks with Major General V. Nikitin, USSR Armed Forces General Staff directorate department chief.

[Buryga] What has caused the need to make changes to the USSR Law

[Nikitin] In my view social justice has been restored. Now there will be a standardized term of service in all branches of the Armed Forces. The initiator is the Defense Ministry. This is the first real step to implement the reform of the Armed Forces.

The Defense Ministry has elaborated a draft temporary provision on active military service by sailors and petty officers on a voluntary basis under contract. I can only say that the contract is concluded for two and one half years with Navy sailors and petty officers after they have had at least six months of active compulsory military service.

The experiment will take place at the Black Sea, Northern, Pacific, and Baltic fleets. The size of remuneration will depend on where service takes place. On a surface ship or a submarine... Hence the size of remuneration, which can be 308 or 77 rubles.

The servicemen who have concluded a contract will be on active compulsory service. Food and uniform will be free. Their families will enjoy the rights and benefits envisaged by existing legislation.

[Buryga] If a serviceman wants to cancel the contract, what awaits him?

[Nikitin] Such a serviceman will have to serve two years, since his term of service under the broken contract will not be counted.

Estonia's Ruutel Sees 'New Period of Crisis'

*LD2305155191 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network
in Estonian 1400 GMT 23 May 91*

[Text] Arnold Ruutel, chairman of the Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet, today received Richard Miles, U.S. consul general in Leningrad. The latter is on a farewell tour. Thanking the U.S. diplomat, Arnold Ruutel noted that mutual understanding, sincerity, and a similar approach to a number of issues have been characteristic of the relations between them during all the time that Miles has been working in Leningrad. Arnold Ruutel said that the diplomat's objective information about the Baltics has also provided the foundation for mutual understanding, which was manifest in the course of his U.S. visit.

In Arnold Ruutel's opinion, a new period of crisis is about to start in the Baltics. Events in Lithuania—both the border conflicts as well as the demands for autonomy put forward by the Polish population—hint at an approaching wave of attacks which may also extend to Latvia and Estonia.

Arnold Ruutel expressed the hope that even in his new responsible post in Berlin, Richard Miles will assist in explaining our problems both in the United States and western Europe. Richard Miles thanked Ruutel for rating his activity so highly.

Estonian Border Guards Reinforced, On Alert

*LD2305195991 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network
in Estonian 0900 GMT 22 May 91*

[Interview with Andrus Oovel, Estonian State Border Guard Department director—live]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The situation on the Estonian border has changed considerably. Andrus Oovel, director general of the state border guard department, first, what about the incident last Sunday?

[Oovel] On Sunday morning an armed attack took place at the Luhamaa checkpoint, and that was not the only one. Yesterday morning at 0030 the same men in the same car and with the same arms attacked the checkpoint at Murati.

[Announcer] What has your department done about it?

[Oovel] We have put all border personnel on a state of alert. This means that all checkpoints have had their teams doubled. We have brought in more men from Remniku training center and—in conjunction with the police department—a police operation to catch the criminals is in progress on the border. [passage omitted]

[Announcer] And we know that the criminals are armed, while the young and energetic men standing on the Estonian border are armed only with truncheons. That is too little. The situation itself tells us that this is too little. Andrus Oovel, what should the republican public at

large, and the Supreme Soviet first and foremost, be doing in order to close our border?

[Oovel] On Monday we will approach the republican government with a draft document which says that having taken one step by setting up the borders, the Republic of Estonia should also take the next step and insure powers to guard them. This means that if the Republic of Estonia Government endorses the draft law on providing arms for border guards, the Supreme Soviet will have to have the decisive say. The men are ready for this, and we must insure their safety. [passage omitted]

Estonia Adopts Regulations on Property Claims

*LD2405054891 Tallinn Estonian Television Network
in Estonian 1900 GMT 20 May 91*

[Excerpts] Today's government session had about 10 items on its agenda, including a discussion of the draft law on foreign investments and issues connected with setting up a property claims register.

[Begin recording] [Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar] The government today adopted a resolution on the procedure for accepting applications from previous property owners and their successors. It will be published in the press in early June. A sample application form for previous owners and their successors has been endorsed. Applications will be accepted through district and town governments. The State Property Department will set up a special commission to work through three main aspects including establishing the fact of property having been unlawfully expropriated, establishing what the unlawfully expropriated property consists of and its cost, and organizing the manner in which applications from previous owners and their successors are to be examined. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Latvian Delegation Statement on USSR Talks

*LD2405084791 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian
0700 GMT 24 May 91*

[Text] Yesterday the Republic of Latvia delegation formed to discuss political, social, and economic questions with the USSR adopted a statement. Among other things, it states:

The attitude of the USSR delegation toward the fulfillment of its tasks very much alarms the delegation of the Republic of Latvia, all the more so because the postponement of the planned meeting coincides with new acts of violence by USSR armed formations against the Republic of Latvia.

On 22 May, there was a raid on the transport militia administration of the Republic of Latvia Ministry of Internal Affairs by the Special Purpose Militia Detachment [OMON] subordinated to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. Also, during the night of 22 and 23 May, OMON units attacked four Latvian customs posts on the Latvia-Lithuania border and demolished them. This unavoidably causes concern that certain forces in

the Soviet Union want to tackle the questions of further relations between the USSR and the Republic of Latvia with the help of armed force, and not by talks.

At the same time, the leaders of the USSR should understand that the talks between the USSR and the Republic of Latvia are at this moment vitally important, not only to the interests of the Republic of Latvia, but also to those of the USSR.

At the present moment, the USSR leadership has declared that the USSR will behave toward those republics which will not join the new Union treaty as it would toward foreign states. As the Republic of Latvia has unambiguously declared that it will not sign the new Union treaty—and this standpoint was supported by the people of Latvia in the 3 March 1991 poll—then in the future, relations between the USSR and the Republic of Latvia must be formed on the basis of bilaterally advantageous interstate treaties, and these treaties must be prepared as soon as possible.

The Republic of Latvia delegation is ready for this work, and accepts the 6-7 June date proposed by the USSR for the next meeting. However, it also expects the USSR's readiness for joint work, and the creation of the necessary peaceful conditions for the talks.

Latvian Communists Protest Dimanis Expulsion

OW2405034191 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1230 GMT 23 May 91

[Text] The Latvian Communist Party's [LCP] newspaper SOVETSKAYA LATVIJA carries a statement made by the Bureau of the LCP Central Committee in connection with the expulsion of the opposition leader Sergei Dimanis from the Latvian delegation to talks with the USSR.

The statement says that "those claiming to work for a law-ruled and democratic state have ignored the opinion of those citizens of Latvia who voted for the parliamentary faction Ravnopraviye (Equal Rights) and favor the preservation of the Soviet Union."

The Bureau urged the Presidium of Latvia's Supreme Council to reconsider its decision and restore the leader of Ravnopraviye as a member of the republic's delegation to talks with the USSR. "Otherwise the Ravnopraviye faction, on behalf of the 400-odd thousand of its backers, will open separate negotiations with the Soviet Union," says the statement.

Latvian Head Postpones Trip Because of Incidents

LD2305191691 Riga Radio Riga Network in Latvian
1730 GMT 23 May 91

[Text] Here is a statement by the Supreme Council chairman:

In connection with the extraordinary incidents on the Latvian-Lithuanian and the Latvian-Belorussian borders

during the night of 22 to 23 May, and in light of the undertakings by the Latvian Supreme Council Presidium and the Latvian Government connected with them, Anatolijs Gorbunovs, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Council, has postponed his trip planned earlier to Ludza and Daugavpils Rayons on 24 and 25 May.

Riga Labor Collectives Stage Protest Meeting

LD2305215591 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 23 May 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A protest meeting was held today in Riga by representatives of labor collectives of the city and nearby areas of Latvia.

[Correspondent N. Kasyanova] Representatives of the strike committees of more than 100 industrial enterprises, together with representatives of the united council of labor collectives, Interfront, the Council of War and Labor Veterans, servicemen, the republican Komsomol, student unions, and other public political organizations came to the building of the republic's Council of Ministers with their protest. This was connected to the fact that the Latvian Government has not replied to the demands made on 14 May by representatives of 42 labor collectives, strike committees, and public political organizations in Latvia.

The statement by the 42 proposed, quote: To adopt a decision on reducing prices on all types of goods and services to the level of all-Union prices; and to rescind the decision on transferring land to its previous owners and their descendants and on transferring the ownership of enterprises and other property to them. With the aim of preventing the republic's economy from slipping to a final collapse, there was also a demand to sign the Union treaty.

The participants in the political action warned the republic's government that if it ignores their demands the workers will be forced to begin a general strike; they place responsibility for the consequences at the door of the republic's government.

Lithuanian Prime Minister Leaves for Moscow

LD2305220691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International
Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 23 May 91

[Text] Prime Minister Gediminas Vagnorius left this evening for Moscow. An agreement has been reached to the effect that because of the border conflicts, he will be received tomorrow by Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Vitaliy Doguzhiyev.

Lithuania Protests Soviet 'Terror Acts'

*LD2305185191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network
in Lithuanian 1800 GMT 23 May 91*

[Text] Gediminas Vagnorius, prime minister of the Republic of Lithuania, has sent a telegram to USSR Minister of Internal Affairs Boris Pugo and USSR Minister of Defense Dmitriy Yazov.

It states: The government of the Republic of Lithuania repeatedly draws your attention to the fact that the Soviet Union, it may be said, does not take any effective measures to put a stop to illegal acts by individual units of the USSR Armed Forces and of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, nor to attacks on the customs posts of the Republic of Lithuania, state institutions, and citizens.

A routine barbaric act on the night of 22-23 May was the predatory attack on five customs posts, which were actually destroyed.

Great indignation is evoked by the fact that during such attacks peaceful citizens were beaten up, their human dignity was violated, and state and personal property was looted.

The escalation of such terror acts compels the Lithuanian Government to state categorically that the patience of our public has limits, that only a few steps remain before open confrontation breaks out, and that the Soviet military by such irresponsible actions is undermining the efforts of the Lithuanian Government to restrain the people from retaliatory measures and undermining the efforts to establish effective contacts—essential for both sides—between representatives of the leadership of the USSR and the Republic of Lithuania. [passage indistinct]

In these circumstances it will be very difficult to halt the indignation of our citizens. We categorically demand that the most resolute measures be taken to put a stop to incidents caused by units of the USSR Armed Forces and of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and by individual servicemen on the entire territory of the Republic of Lithuania.

Moiseyev Denies Paratroopers Moved to Lithuania

*PM2305193991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 May 91 First Edition p 2*

[V. Andreyev report under the "News in This Edition" rubric: "Rumors, Rumors..."]

[Text] In a telephone conversation yesterday with your PRAVDA correspondent, Army General M. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, called the rumors about the transfer to Lithuania of subunits from the Pskov Airborne Assault Division provocative and irresponsible.

At our request, Major General V. Markov, chief of staff of the Airborne Assault Forces, stated specifically that the division's personnel has concluded its evaluation of the results of the winter training and that not a single subunit has moved beyond its deployment bases since 12 May.

Butkevicius Comments on Attacks in Lithuania

*LD2405004391 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International
Service in English 2130 GMT 23 May 91*

[Text] The Soviet Armed Forces have considerably stepped up their activities against the Lithuanian border security and customs system. Last night and today early morning three attacks were carried out on northern Lithuania near the Latvian border line. Up till now the Soviet troops restricted their harassment of the customs officials to the Lithuanian-Belorussian border region only.

According to the Lithuanian State Defense Department, last night's unprovoked attacks were carried out by the Soviet paratroopers and the Black Berets stationed in Riga. At three a.m., a car with the Russian letters reading Politsiya on it and with Latvian license plates drove up to a customs control post in the Birzai region, north of Lithuania. Out of the car dashed three armed Soviet officers who beat up the customs guards, set fire to the customs post premises, and smashed two passing cars after robbing the passengers out [as heard] of their private possessions. The chief of the local border control post was beaten up badly and has been hospitalized.

At approximately the same time, another customs control post was attacked in the Akmene region. Six armed Soviet paratroopers drove up from the Latvian side and, threatening the Lithuanian border guards with guns, undressed them. The border guards were then tied to a railway (?car) [word indistinct] trailers [words indistinct] control post were set on fire to it. The paratroopers left and are suspected of attacking a similar customs control post soon afterwards on the Latvian side. One of the Lithuanian border guards has been hospitalized with a broken rib.

Early morning the third customs control post was attacked by Soviet officers who had come from the Latvian side. This attack was carried out by 11 heavily armed officers. After the (?already) traditional beating up of the Lithuanian border guards, they set fire to the trailer [words indistinct].

Commenting on this night's events, Audrius Butkevicius, general director of the Lithuanian State Defense Department, noted that the Soviets were trying to instigate an armed conflict on the Lithuanian territory and under this pretext to take control over all important state and governmental objects. The Soviet soldiers are well prepared for an action of this kind. Audrius Butkevicius confirmed the fact that the notorious paratroopers division from the Russian city of Pskov has been stationed on the military (?polygon) of (?Perechye) that is situated

on the territories of Lithuania and Belorussia. According to Mr. Butkevicius, tonight's attacks were carried out by Soviet reconnaissance troops from the Black Berets that became ill-famed overnight after the bloodshed of 13 January in Vilnius. Three border [words indistinct] posts were destroyed on the Latvian territory as well.

Speaking to Lithuanian journalists, Audrius Butkevicius said that he had presented the Lithuanian Supreme Council with concrete information about a possible attack on the northern customs (?division). He asked the MP's and the Lithuanian Government to give a clear-cut answer as to how the border guards should behave in case of an armed assault. No definite response was received. Mr. Butkevicius repeated his question today. He thinks that the political and economic interests of the Lithuanian state [words indistinct].

The Lithuanian parliament held a closed sitting today evening to discuss the question.

Official Gives Landsbergis View of Border Attacks

*LD2305161591 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network
in Polish 1500 GMT 23 May 91*

[Text] During today's briefing Audrius Azubalis, press representative of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, gave the Supreme Council chairman's [Landsbergis] official view on the border post attacks:

All this is being done according to a plan prepared in advance. The Soviet Army invasion in 1940 was reported when after the Lithuanian border was crossed two representatives of the Lithuanian border guards were shot. It is true that in the first instance the real border was crossed, whereas now we are only restoring it. The Soviet troops are destroying economic control of the borders of Lithuania to stop the illegal export of goods and to combat the black market. What is happening now is that attempts are being made to destroy us not only politically, [words indistinct] our institutions, but also to destroy us economically and to prevent the Lithuanian Government from organizing a market.

20,000 Farmers Demonstrate in Vilnius

*LD2305225791 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International
Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 23 May 91*

[Text] According to information from the organizers, roughly 20,000 representatives of the Lithuanian countryside arrived in Vilnius today to express their dissatisfaction with the agricultural policy of the government and parliament. Although city authorities did not grant permission for this meeting to be held in Independence Square, at the parliament building, thousands of people gathered here at 1400 today. The participants were addressed from the parliament window by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council; his deputy Ceslovas Stankevicius; Aleksandras Abisala, minister without portfolio, and others.

The most active rural representatives, however, did not want to listen. Groups of people discussed economic difficulties, and many stereotypical remarks were heard about the parliament, the government, and generally about urban inhabitants.

The planned meeting took place an hour later in Kalnu Park and lasted roughly three hours. It was addressed by the Virmantas Valikonis, chairman of the Farmers' Association, which organized the meeting; Deputy Jonas Pangonis, member of this association; Algirdas Brazauskas, chairman of the Democratic Labor party; writer Vytautas Petkevicius and others. The meeting adopted an 11-point resolution which proposes that the adopted agricultural laws that do not correspond to the interests of the majority of the people be revised; that the tax system be revised; that the supplies to agriculture be improved and land given only to those who cultivate it, and so on.

Addressing the parliament chairman, the resolution expresses regret that farmers were not allowed to hold their meeting in Independence Square.

RSFSR

Gorbachev, Yeltsin To Sign 'Important Document'

*PM2305155191 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA
in Russian 24 May 91 p 2*

[RIA report: "The Meeting They Have Been Waiting For"]

[Text] As RIA [Russian Information Agency] has learned from well-informed sources in the USSR Supreme Soviet, USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev is to have a meeting 24 May in Moscow with Boris Yeltsin, head of the Russian Parliament, and the leaders of the Supreme Soviets of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] autonomous republics. According to some reports, it is expected that an important document will be signed, which will be of great significance in the stabilization of the situation in Russia and the country as a whole and will also create more favorable conditions for the signing of the new Union treaty.

Congress of Peoples Deputies Continues Work

LD2305203791

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1845 GMT on 23 May begins carrying a program with recorded excerpts of the proceedings at the Fourth Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow on 23 May. Yeltsin chairs the session.

Deputy Vinogradova speaks first on behalf of the Group of Communists for Democracy. She criticizes RSFSR presidential candidate Zhirinovskiy's speech on 22 May

as a call for interethnic violence. She is followed by Deputy Tarasov who criticizes Alekseyev's speech as a slur on Makashov.

Deputy Isaakov complains that the amendment which he made has not been carried out. He is followed by Deputy Zakharov, chairman of the Editorial Commission, who speaks on changes to the Constitution in connection with the election of the Russian president. There are 147 amendments to be made in this regard, so Zakharov asks for article by article discussion of the law to be followed by a vote on the law as a whole requiring a two-thirds majority.

Yeltsin reminds the deputies that an amendment can be withdrawn by its initiator. The deputies proceed to discuss the law article by article. It is decided that the president cannot be a people's deputy of the RSFSR.

At 1903 GMT Belonogov argues in favor of his amendment against the prohibition of party affiliation for the Russian president. This is put to the vote and rejected. Novkin's amendment on affiliation to nonpolitical movements is also rejected. Babayev defends his amendment which says that a president may cease his political affiliations during his tenure. This amendment also fails. Another deputy complains that his amendment proposing that the president should not engage in entrepreneurial activity has been incorrectly printed. He reads out the correct version. Zakharov recommends accepting this amendment which is duly passed.

Deputy Mateyev complains that the rules would exclude a candidate who is 34 years and 11 months old. He cites young deputies who are excluded because of the age limit. His amendment is rejected.

Another deputy proposes an amendment to say that the president must be healthy. Zakharov cites Roosevelt as a counter argument; the amendment is rejected.

Deputy Mozhayev proposes a 10-year tenure for the president. This amendment is also rejected.

Zakharov declared that 19 amendments have been withdrawn.

At 1915 GMT Yeltsin reads out an announcement on the Leningrad air crash.

At 1917 GMT a member of the commission for food-stuffs and health reads out an address to Ivan Silayev. He complains that the government is not taking steps to revive the Russian countryside. He says that there is very little compensation going to the countryside. He asks Silayev to report to the congress on what measures are being undertaken to revive the countryside in Russia. The time for action is here, he declares.

Yeltsin supports the speaker pointing out that this is a very serious address. Silayev says that he will prepare a report on this subject tomorrow.

Passing on a suggestion from the floor, Yeltsin asks for a show of hands on whether to limit Russian Television coverage of the Congress to 45 minutes in view of the fact that the proceedings have been uneventful and that it is a question of working steadily through the law article by article. This proposal is accepted.

Constitutional Amendments Discussed

LD2305182191 Moscow TASS in English 1750 GMT
23 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Yuriy Kuzmin]

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—The future Russian president will be able to remain a member of a political party and will not have to temporarily withdraw from it, the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation decided today.

The decision was adopted during heated debates on the bill on amendments to the republican constitution. Some 150 amendments had been proposed.

Some deputies believe that president should not depend on any political party. But most speakers insisted that such a provision would be a "violation of human rights" and discrimination for political reasons.

Members of the Communists for Democracy group stated that in his speech on Wednesday, [22 May], presidential candidate Vladimir Zhirinovskiy "made statements, which could be considered as a call for genocide of the Armenian and Georgian peoples".

The non-party deputies group, supported by the Democratic Russia faction, believe that such statements provoke inter-ethnic conflicts and are especially unacceptable when voiced by "a person, aspiring to be president of the multi-national Russian federation".

Exactly at that time, Zhirinovskiy was giving a six-hour news conference to journalists at the main staircase at the Grand Kremlin Palace.

On Friday, [24 May] the Congress will continue to further specify amendments to the constitution of the Russian Federation.

More on New Presidency Law

LD2305150691 Moscow TASS in English 1420 GMT
23 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Boris Zverev]

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—The Russian Congress of People's Deputies (full parliament) today decided that there would be no need for the future president of the Russian Federation, if he is a member of a political party, to suspend his membership.

The congress, which is in session in the Kremlin for the third day, devoted today's meeting to the article-by-article adoption of a law on amendments and

addenda to the republican Constitution in connection with the institution of the executive presidency.

According to the initial version of the law, the Russian president is top office-holder of the Russian Federation and chief executive.

Two main restrictions were provided for holding this office: Firstly, the president must suspend his membership in political parties and mass associations for the time of his presidency. Secondly, he may not hold any other post at state and public bodies or organisations.

It was expected that the item of the law on the president's departyization would provoke the sharpest dispute at the congress. Some deputies spoke about the inadmissibility of this provision, since it violates human rights and leads to discrimination for political reasons.

Amendments submitted by deputies to strike out the item about departyization were not approved by a simple majority during the vote. But the law's sponsors did not win a two-thirds majority when this article was voted as a whole and the proposal was not passed.

Deputies could examine less than 50 per cent of nearly 150 amendments to the law by noon. Work on the law will continue at the night session.

Yeltsin on Relations With Center

OW2205134891 Moscow INTERFAX in English
0930 GMT 21 May 91

[Text] "Major difficulties may arise" at the 4th congress of the RSFSR people's deputies (parliamentarians) "in connection with the discussion of amendments to the republican constitution", said Boris Yeltsin, Chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet to the press prior to the opening of the forum. "But on the whole," emphasized Yeltsin, "the latest parliament session indicates that the passions seem to have died down. There are no more senseless political debates, earlier frequent, instead of doing business." Yeltsin expressed the hope that the congress would be equally business-like, and "we'll be able to finish work by Saturday". Touching on relations with the centre, Yeltsin described them as "normal and business-like". "The President has realized that he will not be able to fulfil the tasks before him without reliance on democrats," said the Russian leader.

Asked why he chose Aleksander Rutskoy, a communist, as his running mate, Yeltsin said, "I build my relations with the Soviet Communist Party as relations with a structure, not with individuals. Rutskoy is a very energetic worker. He can do a lot as vice-president." "Besides," Yeltsin went on to say, "an attempt has been made to put pressure on the military, the KGB, the administrative bodies, senior citizens as many of these people are still undecided whom to vote for. I am convinced that Rutskoy will bring me a good number of votes while other candidacies would alienate a large section of the electorate."

Zhirinovskiy Addresses Congress

LD2305105391 Moscow Russian Television Network
in Russian 1920 GMT 22 May 91

[Speech by Vladimir Volfovich Zhirinovskiy, Russian presidential candidate, at Fourth Russian Soviet Federated Soviet Republic, RSFSR, Congress of People's Deputies session in the Kremlin in Moscow on 22 May—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed deputies, I am glad to have this opportunity to address you. I am going to speak on the subject. I would like it very much indeed if Russia's future presidents always spoke on the subject. We have but one subject—the saving of our state. On this occasion what we are discussing is the issue of the presidential elections. I want to read you an appeal to the Fourth Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies from three candidates for the presidency of the republic. We, registered candidates for the RSFSR presidency, appeal to the lofty congress with the following proposal: that the date of the RSFSR presidential elections be postponed from 12 June of this year until September or October 1991. Our proposal arises from the fact that the time scale determined by the law on the election of the president for nominations and for the conduct of the electioneering campaign for the republic's first president is unnecessarily tight and places the contenders in unequal conditions for the struggle. This appeal has been signed by candidates Zhirinovskiy, Makashov, and Tuleyev—in alphabetical order. Talks are taking place with Ryzhkov and Bakatin. This morning I talked to Boris Nikolayevich personally and asked him to join in this appeal. Whatever his position on this, I hand this appeal to the presidium and ask that this issue be discussed. In the meantime I'll continue to use my five minutes. [voice from the floor: three!] Three, then so be it, I'm prepared to accept standing orders. As a lawyer and international affairs specialist I am able to say that never in the history of our planet has there been any state whatsoever where presidents have been elected in 20 days—not one, even the wildest, most barbaric state would ever allow that to happen. Four months, six months, a year: America has already embarked upon its elections. Why does this happen? Once again we want to encroach upon the rights of some people. Unequal conditions. I have already travelled across the country. Kostroma Oblast was completely closed to me. The rector of Yaroslavl University and Polytechnic did not bring the students in to hear me. If another contender had gone there the hall would have been full. I have empty halls in front of me. They are frustrating the election campaign. In the Ivanovo Oblast they didn't hinder...[changes thought] they hindered my meeting with the town's residents, but when I do meet them their opinions of all the contenders change sharply after one, two, or three hours of discussion with me. They ask very strongly that an opportunity should be provided...[changes thought] they are asking you deputies to provide an opportunity for the residents and voters of Russia to see who is who and who is capable of being a contender for the post of president. More than

that, this is being asked of you by Russians living outside the bounds of the republic. They are not indifferent to the fate of who will become president of Russia, either: they, too, want to participate in the election campaign. I will give you an example. during the referendum in Latvia the Latvians sent voting papers to all Latvians living outside the territory of Latvia. We have 25,000,000 Russians living...[changes thought] today they are packing their suitcases. They're not indifferent to the question of where they are to return to, what kind of Russia it will be, and who is going to be leading it. I am not going to be carried away by the program, therefore. On the agenda you have to listen to me before you give one fifth of your votes in support. That is yet another discriminatory measure, because in that way we place the parties in unequal conditions. A representative of the Social Democrats here has just said our party is a small one and people do not know it. Let's give people an opportunity to get to know the leaders of the parties. But the party that hasn't been able to put forward its own contender, its own leader—I am thinking of the Social Democrats, the Social Democrats, that's how one can assess a party. They do not even have anyone to nominate—they will support other people's candidatures from other political forces. Let the parties which have not been able to nominate anyone and which do not have their own contender think about this. Which party of ours, however—that will be said by the population at the election. Do make it possible for the first time in the history of our state to hold free elections. On 12 June they will not be free elections. That is a mockery of an election campaign, because the voters want to see us. If we do not want to postpone free elections on 12 June—you're very fond of that particular date, the 12th—then by all means let us have a television marathon from 1 to 10 June every day: all television program and all radio stations must give us air time. I am willing, even if it is 24 hours—let us do it, without any break, even for dinner. Let the people see who we are and what we are, if you are not frightened of them, the voters, deciding who should be elected on 12 June. So there are different options. I ask just for one thing: if we want a law-governed state let us not break any more laws; if we really want freedom let us have freedom, especially as there are very many freedom enthusiasts in this hall and people who have come here considering themselves in favor of democracy. So let us not hamper millions of voters. They only thing they ask for is an opportunity to get to know the candidates for the presidency of the republic. I have finished and I expect you to decide today on the issue of whether or not I have received one fifth to enable me to embark upon the election campaign in a normal way. Thank you for your attention. [applause]

Zhirinovskiy's Platform Detailed

*LD2405092191 Moscow Russian Television Network
in Russian 2040 GMT 22 May 91*

[Further speech by Vladimir Volfovich Zhirinovskiy, Russian presidential candidate, at Fourth Russian Soviet

Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Congress of People's Deputies session in the Kremlin in Moscow on 22 May—recorded]

[Text] I have been put forward as a candidate for the office of president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] by a conference of the USSR Liberal Democratic Party, which I have been chairman of since 31 March 1990. This was the first political party to be launched within the framework of the changed Constitution. It held a congress in Moscow last year and adopted stances which it has not deviated from up to now, despite the changing political situation. We ourselves declared at the outset that we would have normal partnership relations with all political parties, including the country's ruling party.

As for my election platform, the main point I should like to draw to your attention to is the need to put an end to the confrontation between Russia and the center. Without this happening, our situation and the situation in the country can only grow worse. I have visited other republics—national and Union republics—several times and have heard people say: As long as you Russians are at odds with Moscow we will all remain in the same situation we are in now. This is all being confirmed. Many of our Union republics have already been reduced to bloodshed and the situation is no better. So the main thing is to put an end to this but not by subjugating Russia to the center but by finding the right compromise formula to ensure full protection for Russia's interests without engendering confrontation, because no state can be governed from several centers. In my view, Russia is the foundation of the state. That is how it was formed in the beginning, and therefore the party's aim, and mine as presidential candidate, is to return to a naturally historical path of development. This should not mean overlordship by any one ideology or political current.

The second main point is to find the right solution to the ethnic issue. Our state is the one with the greatest number of nationalities and largest territory, so if we do not find the right solution to the ethnic issue today we will not advance at all. This is precisely why the economy, for the most part, is failing to advance today. Nobody is willing to invest in or develop production if they do not know what this territory is to be like or which flag is to fly over it. I will tell you here and now that I am against even a single meter of Soviet territory coming under the jurisdiction of an alien, foreign flag. I would therefore like to see questions of sovereignty resolved in the economic sphere. Economic sovereignty, economic power only, should be given to all regions, oblasts and republics, so that they—to put it in down-to-earth language—choke on that power and ask the center to take back part of it. That is the model that is needed; not to reject claims by regions and territories for economic powers but on the contrary to give them as many as possible. The center should retain only seven areas, once and for all; these being foreign policy, defense, finance, transport, communications, energy, and ecology. That is how they do things in Paris, Washington, London, Bonn

and so on. That is how things should be done in Moscow. So there is no need to complicate the issue by dreaming up a new kind of structure; rather, use should be made of what already exists in the world. Therefore, the nationalities issue as an end result—I will say this bluntly, so that I will not be accused later of having covered up until after being elected president, in the way that some deputies get themselves into parliament on the lists of one party and then leave that party and join another; I do not want to be accused of having misled anyone in that way—so the end result of sovereignties in the nationalities issue I see as getting away from dividing up the country into regions on ethnic lines, because such a situation does not exist in any country in the world. Regions there can be, yes, of course, regions, oblasts, governorships, call them what you like, departments, states or whatever. But division along ethnic lines leads to civil war; it complicates and constantly drags out the nationalities issue which is the most complicated and the most sensitive issue, which has not yet been resolved anywhere in the world—either in affluent Canada, in cultured France or in formerly fraternal Yugoslavia. It takes on bloody forms everywhere if it is constantly dragged on. That is what we have been doing in recent years and in so doing we have been exacerbating the ethnic issue.

So, as a possible future president of Russia I want to raise the Russian issue, not because I want the Russian nation to lord it again, but because we have raised all the ethnic issues as they relate to all regions but have forgotten about the Russian people—155 million Russians that nobody needs! They find themselves in a particularly sorry plight in the national republics—25 million Russians there have become second class citizens. This is why I would very much like to see the new president of Russia be not only president of Russia but president for all Russians living on the territory of the USSR and all Russian speakers, and take under his protection all the small peoples. I will say quite forthrightly, the center is dithering over what to do about Georgia. I would come down on the side of defending the Abkhaz and Ossetian peoples, small peoples which the democratic government of Georgia today is turning into second-class people and destroying before our very eyes, destroying them. Therefore I say that it is necessary for the president of Russia to take a clear stance. There is no need to hold meetings with them in the foothills of the Caucasus. Let them come here, to Moscow. One of the reasons for raising the question of the sovereignty of Russia lies in this question... and if I am elected I will transfer the residence of the president of Russia here, to the Kremlin. They should be based side by side, together, the two cabinets and the USSR president and the president of Russia. That would bring more order and then people, the population of the whole country would understand that Russia, Moscow, the center and the USSR are all one. Only such a unified policy will be capable of giving us the possibility of rebirth, and Russia is aching for rebirth yet we lack a good midwife. So that is what is needed.

Next, I recognize that the moral and political climate in the country is not the most favorable. I promise to adopt all necessary measures—particularly where this concerns attitudes to the governing party—I promise to adopt all measures to put an end to the anti-communist bacchanalia in particular regions and particular arenas. Within the framework of the law, of course, but this anti-Communism should not be permitted. We are leaping from one extreme to another. Communism—we are all, so to speak, for this—but now there is a section of the population who are anti-Communists. In a word, the words Russian and Communist have now become almost an insult. Officer likewise has become an insult. This cannot be allowed. The moral and political climate in the country has turned against the state. No state in the world would permit the creation on its own territory of such a large number of organizations with the declared aim of destroying that state. Nobody should allow this. So whereas democracy presupposes permitting parties, permitting newspapers, democracy appears also to assume the opposite process—banning parties, banning newspapers, not applying certain laws and introducing new laws. As we understand it things can follow only one line: Either everything is banned for decades, and nothing is permitted and we all become serfs again; or else everything is permitted and we have bacchanalia, anarchy, and nobody knows anything.

Now the main thing—the economy. I know you will say: So what about the economy? Everyone knows it's in a bad way. What can be done with the economy? We must start again from scratch. First, if I am elected president of Russia, then the first day after the announcement of my election the USSR president and I will issue a joint statement saying that the confrontation between Russia and the center is at an end and that civil war in the USSR is over. All citizens, irrespective of political convictions, nationality or social group, should enjoy equal protection from the president of Russia and the president of the USSR. The law should operate in time and space across the whole territory of the USSR. There are no laws today. As the ancient Greek philosopher Plato said, long before Russia or Europe existed: Any state where the force of law does not operate, where some force does not operate, will perish. And how we are perishing today. The main position—this is the ideology of our party, and my personal position as a jurist, a jurist in international affairs—is that law should be paramount, all actions should be within the law, and naturally within the new constitution and the new civil and criminal legislation.

Now, about the economy; we must start from scratch. All restrictions must be lifted on all forms of economic activity. Our citizens do not know what kind of activity they can engage in. We still have prohibitions in force. We all call on them to get involved in business and private enterprise, yet we forget that there is an article in the criminal code which forbids this, and in any oblast, any investigator or procurator could prosecute any citizen engaging in those activities to which we urge them from high platforms like this one. So, as long as there

remains this rift between ideology, politics, economics and the law we will get nowhere. So there has to be a unified package of measures—a new president, a new constitution, new legislation, a new system of economics—everywhere and at the same time. Either we are going for the market or we are not. We can not go on running this sack race. We must free ourselves from the sack. There are places where a sack race is amusing, it makes people laugh in an amusement park, well, that is the kind of laughter we are provoking today in the West, making a sack race out of our attempt to move to a different system and sort out the economy. In this sense, too, my program is what might be called one of conciliation. Democratic Russia also wants my program and that of our party: all forms of ownership, a universal approach, and a taxation policy in the interests of producers and then, as a consequence, in the interests of consumers, but here again we must not strike at the state sector. We have put obstacles in the way of the development of the private sector, too. So directors and workers at major enterprises should not be afraid that privatization will do away with the state sector. In any country in the world the state sector represents between 30-60 percent, so there should be no fears. We are provoking fears by depicting new political enemies and now we are creating scares over new economic enemies. The director is the enemy and the workers are the enemy, and the heroes are the businessmen, those who set up cooperatives, and so on. Well, all should be given equal opportunities and identical taxation policies, and let them all compete in equal conditions—everyone who wants to. The same should also apply in the rural areas—let collective and small farmers work the way they want to, and with the normal rules of competition. In some cases a large collective farm will swallow up small farmers and in others small farmers will carve up a badly run collective farm. Let everything gradually take its course, but only on the basis of economics; politics and ideology should not come into it. If we turn the model around and put the economy first, and then the sociopolitical processes that flow from it, we will win through. But as thing stand we put ideology and politics first.

As far as attitudes to the army are concerned, the issue was also distorted here in our country and the population took criticism on this the wrong way. If the military industry did perhaps take too much money from the budget, what has that got to do with the soldiers and officers? In our country they are also the poorest in the world. In terms of the work they do, and I have studied foreign armies, the poorest officers and soldiers are in our army. But we just cause more harm, saying that is where the money is, so let's cut the army, let's cut spending on the army. We have to get this right. It's all very well cutting the military budget in the sense of cutting military factories, but at the same time we must not jeopardize modern technology. If we close down our big factories which are capable of producing goods we can sell for foreign currency—personally, I would sell these goods for foreign currency—and when there, on the foreign market, there is no longer a customer for the

output of our military factories, that is the time they should begin a gradual switch to civilian production. Instead, ideology get in the way again here, and we ask ourselves why we are selling tanks. We must sell everything there! Even if a particular market doesn't interest us, we still need to try to acquire goods from there: for everything we want to acquire there, we must sell part of our output. Here we have always been hindered by ideology. Ideology won't get in my way! I am free of dogmas. My political views have always been the same as they are now. I come from a long line of lawyers. My grandfather was a lawyer under the Tsar. My father was a lawyer, before the war, under the Stalin regime, and I am a lawyer today, and my son has gone to the law faculty. So that is one point. Throughout the world, 80 percent of leaders are arts graduates. I have a double arts background. Our most vexed issue is the nationalities question. I graduated with distinction from the Institute of the Countries of Asia and Africa. My profession has a link with the inhabitants of the majority of our Turkic-speaking regions—Kazakhstan, Central Asia, the Transcaucasus and the Near East. I could address the Turkic-speaking deputies in their own language at this very moment. I would be nice for them if the president of Russia understood them and knew the culture and language of this multi-million-strong people of our country, of our Russia. And so that they understand me, I will switch languages. Now I can speak Turkish because today we may elected the president, but what sort of president will it be, this will depend on you. [preceding sentence in Turkish] I will revert to Russian because I have very great respect for it and I would very much like the whole country to respect the Russian language, just as it is respected today in Europe and America, whereas in the Baltic and some other regions they have a very negative attitude toward it.

That is why my view is that this whole range of issues must be tackled in a different way, along with foreign policy. Many people refer to the economic program. We have many economic programs, but where can you get the money?

I suggest that a different foreign policy is a source of money—a radically different foreign policy.

Yesterday, you learned from the mass media that Mengistu Haile Mariam fled Ethiopia. This is a regime in which we invested billions. [no figure or unit as heard] He fled—but who will return our billions to us? What will make them come back from Africa, from Latin America, and from Asia? It is, after all, an impossible foreign policy to pursue. We invested billions, we got our people killed—and these regimes have collapsed. Some foreign policy!

I have every right to speak on the subject because I am an internationalist twice over—both as far as my primary education is concerned and as far as my secondary education is concerned. I can speak *tete a tete* to the president of France in his mother tongue. When we are told that our leaders have *tete a tete* meetings, it is

untrue—interpreters are by their side. But, as for me, I will speak to him *tete a tete*—and with Kohl in German, and with Bush in English. [applause] I have already had *tete a tete* conversations with them in Bonn. I removed the members of my delegation, asked the diplomats of the German Foreign Ministry to leave, and I had a *tete a tete* chat with Mr. Schaefer, deputy foreign minister of the Federal Republic of Germany, and Genscher.

So, I am not just theorizing. I have already done it. I have visited 10 countries of Europe, Asia, and America, and everywhere I met those upon whom the future of our world depends, and I did not encounter, from their point of view, any disagreement with, or opposition to the kind of foreign policy I can pursue. You might say: You will be the president of Russia. But I want both Russia and the Soviet Union to have the same foreign policy. In foreign policy one must move from the West-East relationship to the North-South relationship. It is a safer and cheaper one, giving us friends who possess a high degree of culture and technology: North America, northern Europe, and Japan. Today, however, our friends do not, unfortunately, stand out by their high degree of culture or their riches. It is as though we opted, on purpose, for the poorest, the weakest and, in the final analysis, we ourselves have become like them. As the Russian proverb puts it: You become like those you associate with. They are striving to become rich, but for all our lives in our country, we have been putting the rich on the same footing as the poor; we are all equal because we are all poor. As far as the international situation is concerned, our friends were the poorest states. We wanted the rich countries to collapse, and the whole world to become poor. However, the entire world chose a different path. Everyone wants to be rich.

So, let us make Russia rich and cultured, so that the Union republics do not recoil from us, using guerrillas and flags of their own, but so that they ask, so that they send delegations here, as they did to the Russian tsar. When 100 or 200 years ago the Georgian tsar sent his delegation, Georgia was perishing, awash with blood spilt by alien invaders. This treaty says: With Russia, for eternity. This was Georgia that was asking, but today it rejects us, and today, the Transcaucasus Military District troops there are occupants. If we were not there, there would have been no Georgia or Armenia on the political map of the world. I say this as an eastern expert. The maps of the general staff of the Iranian and Turkish armies do not show Georgia—it is shown as provinces of Turkey and Iran. The word Batumi is not written there—it is Batum-kale, Sukhum-kale, and it is only because Soviet troops are there that Georgia and Armenia exist.

Here, then, is the gratitude of very close brothers. To begin with, they threw us out of eastern Europe. They are knocking tanks off their pedestals. Why did our tank troops enter Prague on 9 May? So that latter-day democrats can sit there, making a mockery of the memory of our soldiers and officers? This is a blow one must not endure any longer. We must understand that Russia should conduct different policies.

You see how they are betraying us, in Africa, Europe, and Asia. But the new president and the new Russia must become a mighty power so quickly that they come to understand in Eastern Europe that a strong Germany is in the West but we will no longer come to help.... We will rather come to an accommodation with Germany. A strong Turkey and Iran are in the south but Russian soldiers will no longer shed their blood in the Transcaucasus. We will reach an accord with the Turks and with Iran all the sooner. So, let them stop and think about the future of their countries and not strive for independence. However, it must be given and let Georgia and Armenia die for the edification of all the peoples of the USSR. They will die within a year; these two republics will disappear and it is a matter of great regret for me, but it will take place because they are in a region in which they will not be able to stand on their own two feet.

What am I talking about, then, for I do not wish anything bad to anyone. I am talking of Russia. Let us pursue new policies, so that we are respected, so that there is a desire to be with us, so that delegations from all over sit there and ask: Russia, help us, we want to be with you. Today they recoil from us. We are people who are not needed by anyone, down with you! Get out! Rail routes are blocked. That is why only another new concept and resolution of internal questions and external policies will help Russia get on its feet, accomplish a renaissance and become a mighty, cultural and rich power. I understand you are tired, but when you elect me as president, and the population, you will have to listen to the president until he has finished, as happens in the West, even if it is 24 hours. For the time being, I am only a candidate and I am going to finish but in principle, presidents must be listened to till the end. I am a candidate at the moment, that is why, in conclusion, I ask again: If we want to become a free and democratic country, I ask you very much to pause and think both of the date of the elections and of the conduct of the election campaign, because these are still not free elections, believe me. Let us come to grips with this fear. The population in our country is fearful—it is fearful of the new economy, fearful of the new political parties. Today you are deputies and you already have various political views, but we are again afraid of holding normal elections according to European standards. We already made haste once. There has already been a situation when it was too early yesterday, too late tomorrow so it must only be done today. Well, the date of 12 June reminds me very much of the date of 25 October 1917. Let us not be in too much of a hurry. Let things be slow, let our population get ready and let it calmly take a look during the summer at who these five or six candidates are. So, I will end my speech and am ready to answer questions. [applause]

Statement Opposes Zhirinovskiy

LD2305125891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 1130 GMT 23 May 91

[Excerpt] At the Fourth Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputies. Our correspondent Olga Vasilenko will speak about another day of the congress' work. She is at the microphone.

[Vasilenko] I must say that it is very difficult for both the chairman, who presides at the congress, and the deputies to work today. The thing is that amendments to the draft law on changes and addenda to the RSFSR Constitution are being discussed. These changes and addenda relate to the law on the RSFSR president, and the deputies are treating each amendment and addendum extremely thoroughly. There are 147 amendments altogether, and only slightly more than 20 have been examined. So it is difficult to imagine that the deputies would be able to complete it all today, as was planned.

The day started with a statement by a number of groups of deputies, including the "Communists for Democracy," "Smena," non-party members, and "Democratic Russia," which says that they will not support presidential candidate Zhirinovskiy. The day started with this statement and everywhere in the lobby we can hear remarks questioning how, after all, it happened that the congress voted for its inclusion in the voting list. Just before this report I spoke with Vladimir Petrovich Rasskazov, RSFSR people's deputy, and he spoke on this very topic. So, Vladimir Petrovich, which kind of a statement was that?

[Begin Rasskazov recording] You know, this congress started calmly, even sluggishly, I would say. But we are already accustomed to surprises, which are unavoidable, and frankly speaking, one could feel in the atmosphere in the audience that a surprise of some kind was imminent. I suppose that the Zhirinovskiy surprise was a very carefully and deeply thought-out job prepared at home, so to speak. As a matter of fact, he did not conceal that. In his speech yesterday he said that he represented a third force, that he would orient himself...[changes thought] that there were many of them, that there was certain support. Besides, you remember that in his earlier statements, before he became a candidate, he said that they—he, personally—had had consultations with Defense Minister Yazov and Kryuchkov, well, at that level. So one should not be surprised at his appearance on this political scene. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Communist Group Criticizes Zhirinovskiy

LD2305145391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network
in Russian 1200 GMT 23 May 91

[Remarks by Yelena Viktorovna Vinogradova, people's deputy of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, coordinator of the Group of Communists for Democracy, at the RSFSR Fourth Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow on 23 May—recorded]

[Text] People's deputy of the RSFSR, coordinator of the Group of Communists for Democracy, Vinogradova, Yelena Viktorovna. Point of order. Yesterday in his speech at the fourth congress, people's deputy of the RSFSR, presidential candidate of the RSFSR, Zhirinovskiy made statements which could be interpreted as a call for the genocide of the Armenian and Georgian peoples, as an insult to the peoples of a number of

foreign countries. The deputies' group of Communists for Democracy considers it absolutely impermissible to use the lofty tribune of the congress to inflame interethnic strife and resolutely protests against the inhumane appeals especially unacceptable from a person who is a candidate to the post of head of the multiethnic Russian Federation. Joining in this appeal are deputies' groups: Democratic Russia, Leftist Center, Radical Democrats, Non-Party Deputies, Smena Group, Workers' Union Group, United Faction of Social Democrats, and Russian Party of the Republic.

Deputy Assails Zhirinovskiy

LD2305173191 Moscow Russian Television Network
in Russian 1400 GMT 23 May

[Video report by journalist Viktoriya Zub—from the "RSFSR Congress Diary"]

[Excerpts] [Zub] The third day of the Fourth Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies is in progress. This third day is probably the first day of the most complex, constructive, and productive work for the deputies. I have in my hand 49 pages of amendments to the Russian law on changes and additions to our Constitution, which have to be either adopted or rejected by the deputies. Of course, it is very hard work. It is proceeding very calmly and in a businesslike manner, except that today began in an emotional fashion, and its tone referred to yesterday. [passage omitted]

[Video shows Zub interviewing three RSFSR people's deputies, D.A.Volkogonov, V.P.Lukin and V.V.Ryumin]

[Zub] We shall also recall this day in our conversation with deputies today. It is probably no coincidence that the congress' work today began with events which occurred yesterday afternoon, or even in the evening sitting. What do you think?

[D.A.Volkogonov] I think it is no coincidence, because yesterday an event which, on the surface, might not be very important took place, showing that there is a lot of agitation both at the congress and in society. But I should also briefly like to say this. Yesterday the congress listened to the manifesto of one of the candidates, Zhirinovskiy, who has indeed already become a candidate now. In general, it is perhaps not worth saying a lot about Zhirinovskiy, because such people always crop up in times like these, in troubled, alarming times; people with a rabble-rousing turn of mind, who try to propose something miraculous and messianic, have always cropped up.

What struck me was something else, the way that the hall listened and very many deputies applauded, the delighted shouts with which they supported the speaker on the platform. I had a profound feeling of shame yesterday when I saw the results of the voting on the screen, when almost 500 people—I think it was 477—voted to include Zhirinovskiy on the list as a candidate

for the post of president. I stress that Zhirinovskiy is entitled to hold his views and to express them as he wants and is able to, but we deputies all not entitled at all to be incapable of distinguishing rabble-rousing from statesmanlike thinking. In this regard, I should simply like to express regret on behalf of our deputies, because I was, really, simply ashamed during the hour that I was there yesterday. However, I believe the people who watched the program in the evening realized what was what and would not have acted as a significant number of deputies at the congress did. [passage omitted]

I am confident that the voters will be better than parliament at understanding what is what and will not commit the shameful blunder which the congress did yesterday. I believe people are, simply, perfectly well aware today that two powerful wings, two trends, are active in society. One trend is connected with the policy of reforms. We have no alternative: wise, calm reforms, which require accord. In particular, the well-known Nine plus One agreement, as it has already been dubbed, opens the way. It is, essentially, possibly the only, historic chance left for accord. [passage omitted]

The other trend, the existence of which needs to be borne in mind, is, essentially, an attempt to return to the old ways, dressed up in various ways, a genuine return to the old ways, or, at best, an attempt to ensure a standstill, meaning, in practice, the stagnation which we had for many, many years. In fact, if you look at the manifestations of all the presidential candidates who have come out openly today, you can clearly observe a struggle between these two principles or trends, however the candidates dress themselves up. Therefore, I feel that the common sense and public awareness of our people, our society, are significantly higher and more mature than we ourselves sometimes suppose. They will make a fine job of working things out and will distinguish genuine buffoonery and frivolity from serious proposals dictated by the interests of our society. [passage omitted]

Tuleyev Launches Campaign

LD2305181491 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT
23 May 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—"If I am elected Russian president, there will be no conflict between the centre and Russia," one of the six candidates for the post, Aman Tuleyev, presently a people's deputy to the Kemerovo regional executive committee, told TASS with confidence today.

As a contender he is now attending the Fourth Congress of Russian People's Deputies in Moscow. The crucial items on the agenda of the congress are those associated with the institution of the executive presidency in Russia.

Today, on the Congress's third day of work, deputies are debating amendments to the republican constitution associated with the institution of the new post.

The elections are scheduled for June 12, and the contenders have started their campaigns by participating in numerous meetings with journalists at the congress.

Aman Tuleyev stressed that he is backed by a strong army of supporters consisting mainly of economic managers, according to the contender.

"The positions of practically all of my rivals," Tuleyev said, "are vulnerable because of weak links with real life". He added that if he won the elections he would appoint a man capable of doing rough work as his prime minister.

Discussing work currently done by Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev, Tuleyev noted that he liked Silayev's economic programme. However, Tuleyev noted, the premier lacks determination in carrying out reforms.

As for his rivals' programmes, Tuleyev singled out the scale and specific positions outlines in the programme of former Interior Minister Vadim Bakatin and Liberal Democratic Party leader Vladimir Zhirinovskiy. Tuleyev stressed, however, that should he fail during the first stage of the elections he would not vote for any of the others.

"The present elections cannot be called fair because a man without a name to himself finds it practically impossible to make his programme known to people," Tuleyev complained.

Along with two other contenders—General Albert Makashov and Vladimir Zhirinovskiy—Aman Tuleyev called on the Russian parliament to adjourn the elections until September or October. However the congress decision on the election date still stands.

Tuleyev on Presidential Policy

LD2305143191 Moscow Russian Television Network
in Russian 1014 GMT 22 May 91

[Interview with Russian presidential candidate Aman Gumirovich Tuleyev by program presenter Aleksandr Shashkov at the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Fourth Congress of People's Deputies session in the Kremlin—live, from the Vesti newscast congress Diary]

[Text] [Shashkov] Aman Gumirovich, if you become president, what do you think, how from your point of view should the relationship of the president and the local authorities be built?

[Tuleyev] First of all it should be noted that today's power vacuum must be ended and the quicker the better because it is impossible to go on governing the country and the republic amid this anarchy of permissiveness. If I were chairman of the Soviet I would not depend on

anyone. Only on the session. It is absurd. Now for the second question: the number of deputies I think should be reduced by five or six times. In the towns and rayons it should be determined how many there should be in the rayon or the town. That should be determined collectively. The number of deputies would be less. They must work at a professional level and receive a salary for their work. There should be strong executive presidential power. I think that at oblast level a chairman or governor as we would call him should be elected by direct vote, direct and that's that. But the governor should select his own team, starting with the settlement soviet and ending with him on contractual basis. If you want to work, work, you know it's tough, you know you'll shorten your life, you know you won't sleep, you know people will put pressure on you. That's your reward for not living a long life because there's no other way now. But he will be working then, he will not be waiting for someone to tell him what to do, he will not be stabbing the governor in the back, he will not be passing the buck. It's up to you in the end, when the governor comes down the whole team comes down. Now for the question of how it should be built, yes?

[Shashkov] The question is now of the structure of tough presidential power. As the structure should be sufficiently strong....

[Tuleyev] Just so, otherwise we won't be able to do anything. Now the question is how relations should be between the president and the soviets, isn't it? How they should be between the oblast soviets and the soviets of different levels. Powers should be demarcated between soviets. We must say: Comrades, this is a town, this is an oblast. There's no other way, so for God's sake don't you go beyond this circle.

But as for the president and the soviets I think the person who has been elected governor of an oblast or chairman—he should be the president's adviser and before the president undertakes something, emergency measures for instance, he should act as a buffer smoothing the way between the soviet and the president. That's what I think.

[Shashkov] But in those conditions the rights of the local soviets will be infringed.

[Tuleyev] They won't. I think that if he is elected by people's vote, by vote of all the people, and if he works directly with the president, there should be intellect and sobriety and counsel. You can always find the golden mean that is favorable to people. That's what I think for the moment, although it does need to be polished.

[Shashkov] What do you think, this question is to be discussed today at the session of the congress, will it arouse controversy?

[Tuleyev] Most likely. It is the super-question. For today it is the super-question.

[Shashkov] And how do you assess your chances of becoming president because in the previous interview Ivan Polozkov named you as one of the unknown candidates?

[Tuleyev] That really is so. I am known in the Kuzbass perhaps and a little bit outside it but for Russia I am unknown. So it is the time factor. If there were time it would be a moot point who is who.

[Shashkov] That's why you wrote a letter asking for the elections to be put back?

[Tuleyev] Yes, only for that reason, not to make it unstable or drag it out and so on. But I think that if... everything should be honest. Everything should be honest. If you are a person without a name you cannot succeed, it's not realistic. You need time. But now the chairman of the Supreme Soviet has emergency powers, allocated by the congress, and Russia will not lose anything in this period of time, so get on with the work, get on with the work, the powers have been given, just get on with the job so the people can enjoy the fruits of it.

[Shashkov] Thank you.

Bakatin Outlines Policy

LD2305133391 Moscow TASS in English 1310 GMT
23 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 23 TASS—Judging by the interest displayed by Russian legislators in the 13-point election platform of Russian presidential hopeful Vadim Bakatin, member of the Soviet Security Council, this number has become lucky for him.

He set out his platform at a meeting in the Kremlin with participants in the Fourth Russian Congress of People's Deputies, which is sitting in session in the Kremlin for the third day.

The Central Election Commission registered six candidates for the presidency in the largest Soviet republic. The elections will be held on June 12.

According to Bakatin, "the foreign policy of the Russian Federation will rely on the will of republican congresses, and it will be aimed at confidence-building, cooperation and disarmament".

The domestic policy is a flat rejection of hesitations and semi-measures, he continued. The economy should develop along social and market lines and be open to world economic ties.

The candidate stressed that his presidency will be based on the principle of concord, which will be key-noted for its openness and honest power. In this he sees the difference from the present policy pursued by the Russian and all-union governments.

"I'm ready to cooperate with any party, workers, peasants and various movements but not for the purpose of

decrying new or old dogmas," which are of no interest today, but for the purpose of constructive cooperation.

"The Russian president must be president for all Russian peoples, must not have ideological sympathies. The president should have only one god—law."

The candidate named another indispensable principle to be followed—continuity. "It is impossible to invent everything again and again.

"Continuity is experience accumulated in an interesting and difficult period of Russian history. This experience deserves to be used by anyone who will come to office."

Bakatin disagreed with the three principal issues of the programme issued in the press by Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev to stabilise the economy.

The candidate believes that there is no point in fighting for the change of a signboard—the transition of enterprises from one jurisdiction to another. The main thing is their complete and unconditional independence.

Only independence can settle industrial problems. Measures of the population's social protection should be also singled out. They should take precedence before any economic measures. "Man is now again thrown into the chaos of humiliations," he stressed.

Analysts believe that people, who are dissatisfied with presidential candidates Boris Yeltsin and Nikolay Ryzhkov, may vote for the former Soviet interior minister, who holds the centre-left position and supports the policy of President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Bakatin named Ramazan Abdulatipov, chairman of the Russian parliament Council of Nationalities, as his running mate. Abdulatipov is a representative from the Dagestan Autonomous Republic in the northern Caucasus.

This choice may raise Bakatin's chances to win the population in autonomous republics of the Russian Federation, where, as the results of the Russian referendum showed, Yeltsin does not enjoy popularity.

Makashov Details Program

*LD2305105291 Moscow Russian Television Network
in Russian 1913 GMT 22 May 91*

[Speech by Albert Mikhaylovich Makashov, Russian candidate president, at the Fourth Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Congress of People's Deputies session in the Kremlin on 22 May—recorded]

[Text] The chairman asked me on two occasions what I want to say at this congress. I ask for six minutes and I will say what I think about the state of things presently and about our presidency. I am the same general whose five minute speech at the party congress caused so much stir in the country, abroad, and in this hall. I have a feeling and I am convinced that most people did not hear or read this speech. This kind of publicity was provided

by a part of our press that is sick with hepatitis [oblique reference to "yellow" press, the Russian expression for "gutter" press], acting on command of the cosmopolitans [Jews], it went into action against the general's trouser stripes. [raucous laughter among part of the audience]. But, after all, the main content of the general's speech and thoughts was and remains patriotism, of the kind that we have forgotten and that we wish our people to forget. It is not beauty that will save Russia, but unity of patriotic forces, as happened at difficult times for our much-suffering state.

The means of propaganda—of propaganda, not agitation—made me into a dictator, a general with an iron hand, a Caligula who will ride into this hall on a white horse. So I came to this rostrum, prompted by the will of those who over a period of two days gave 144,000 signatures without any support from the party, television or the press. There are no words left to appraise the situation in the country—only invectives remain. What, then, is it that I wish to do for my people? We are for a united and indivisible Russian Federation within the 1945 borders; for a stabilization of the situation; for interethnic consensus; for the restoration of law and order; the observance of the Constitution and of the existing laws; for an equal development and existence of forms of ownership: private and labor, collectives and state ownership. We are not for privatizing, but for sovietizing the economy; factories to go to the workforces without any buying out. We are for an equal development of collective, state, and individual farms: land to be made available free of charge for use without time limits, but without a right to sell. We are for a real help to agriculture, for a cessation of interference—no matter on whose part—in the affairs of collective farmers and peasants.

Experience and combining the plan and market regulation garnered worldwide, garnered worldwide, in Japan, the United States, and Western Europe alike, must be extensively put to use. The progress of science and technology and a lowering of costs and prices must be stimulated. Cooperatives and firms which engage in speculation must be closed down and those which produce goods must be encouraged. State monopoly for foreign trade must be restored. The selling off of Russia to foreign capital must be prevented. Technology, patents, and machine tools must be imported, rather than luxury goods. War and labor veterans and young people in educational establishments must be given comprehensive support and assistance. Normal, human conditions must be created on the territory of Russia for the troops being withdrawn from Western Europe. Let our holy fathers and mullahs pray, but not the legions of the Pope of Rome. We are for the restoration of patriotism, the Russian history, the heritage of the cossacks and the traditions of all the peoples of the RSFSR. We are for supporting ethnic cultures, for creating favorable conditions for the creative intelligentsia, for patriots. The equality of the Russian-speaking population in the other republics of the Union must be ensured.

Soviet power must be regenerated through electing deputies from within labor collectives. The budget of the local soviets must be guaranteed first and foremost, through deductions from the profits made by all the enterprises on the territory of the soviets. We are against the creeping capitalism affecting our society, against unemployment and the shameless price increases. I call on the presidential candidates to join me in supporting the people's demand to have the price rises on essential goods repealed. It is not the people, but the shadow economy and the speculators that must be shaken up. I propose that the decision to sell tanks and R140 million abroad [as heard] and the investigation be made public. I propose to the candidates for the post of president of Russia to join me in signing a declaration of income. I propose that on 12 June the voters use the reverse side of the ballot paper to state whether they are for or against price rises. I challenge Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin to face me honestly in a live television broadcast without a supporting team or helpers. [laughter, applause] Let the voters judge us. I do not promise that greater prosperity will come in 500 or 1,000 days and nights. I do promise constitutional order through the law, where each person has a duty to work and not to speculate, to fulfil the existing laws and it is on this basis that foodstuffs and essential goods should appear in the republic. The Russian Federation should be a republic of workers and peasants, of creative and labor intelligentsia, patriots of their homeland, and not of cosmopolitans, spongers, speculators, and scoundrels of all hues.

[Yeltsin, interrupting] Your six minutes are over....

[Makashov] One minute. I am finishing. [shouts from hall] Eisenhower was a president; De Gaulle was a president, you had generals in South Korea, but, after all, it is history [laughter and applause] and listen, South Korea, just as Taiwan, did make good under the generals' leadership. I am not here talking of the actor Reagan, or of the former first secretaries of oblast committees. I am a soldier and a commander of troops of a district and I say what I think, as distinct from those who say one thing, think another, and do something else again. If I fail to fulfil my promises, you can crucify me on this rostrum after two years. [laughter, applause]

[Yeltsin] Albert Mikhaylovich, time is up.

[Makashov, continuing] And it is possible....

[Yeltsin] Albert Mikhaylovich, seven minutes, Albert Mikhaylovich....

[Makashov, continuing] ...And it is possible to have this quality of a straight and honest leadership, needed as never before in an epoch of lies, fraud, egoism, and the omnipresent political prostitution. [shouts, applause] And it is not the post of president I will fight you for, but a unified, indivisible and rich Russia.

Yeltsin Comments on Candidacy, Platform

PM2305190891 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
24 May 91 Union Edition p 3

[Interview with B.N. Yeltsin by R. Lynev; date and place not given: "The Aim is the Renewal of Russia: B.N. Yeltsin Answers IZVESTIYA's Questions"]

[Text] [Lynev] Boris Nikolayevich, many people see you as the number one candidate in the election campaign that has begun for the post of president of Russia. What are your feelings as you enter what is, for you, a new phase? Do you only expect to win, or do you have doubts about it?

[Yeltsin] Russia's top leader, the president, is being elected for the first time. And not by congress, but by the whole people. That gives rise to certain feelings. But I believe that in an election campaign you cannot give way to your feelings.

The other presidential candidates are also well known. They are experienced politicians and—this is very important—people representing different views and approaches. I would not like to say beforehand which candidate will come first and which second. As for winning, I think every candidate expects to win.

[Lynev] Your political stance, and also your economic views, are generally well known, and have a good many supporters. At the same time, you also hear people saying: Yeltsin has been in power for a year, but what has actually been done?

[Yeltsin] It would be easier for me to answer that question if a year ago the people of Russia had had ownership, including ownership of land, and a whole package of rights, and if the people's elected representatives had had real power. But this was not the case. All this had to be achieved in the course of this year. What has been achieved? Only a year ago, if I may be frank, Russia had fewer real rights than any autonomous republic, or even oblast. Now much has changed here. Many citizens of the republic have remembered that their Motherland is not only the Soviet Union, but first and foremost Russia. Russian radio and television have begun to operate and Russian newspapers have started to appear. There have also been changes in economic life. This spring, 22,200 private farmers began working in Russia, and a good many exchanges, companies, and joint-stock companies have been set up. The first treaties are being concluded between sovereign Russia and other countries. It is also important that the Union leadership has begun to reckon with Russia and the other republics.

But life in the republic, despite a number of important laws it has adopted, has not improved. The laws do not operate. And this happens largely because there are as yet no real levers of power. That being so, power is bound to work poorly, particularly in the localities. The time has come to change the power structure to ensure that the laws that have been adopted finally start to operate. So

that life changes for the better in practice, not just on paper. And that is the thrust of my election program, which puts the emphasis on the implementation of radical reforms. First and foremost in the economy. You cannot drag out the transition to the market, assuring people that the more radical the change, the worse things will be for them. What could be worse than this running on the spot, in fact on the brink of the abyss?

The next priority in my program is the maintenance of civil peace and stability in society. The mechanism for maintaining civil peace is, in my view, not a state of emergency, but a "roundtable," which has already demonstrated its effectiveness repeatedly. This was the case during the resolution of the strike crisis, and in the work of parliament, when the conciliation commission was set up. Eventually the USSR president and the leaders of nine republics sat at a "roundtable," and then so did the leaders of Russia's republics.

[Lynev] Your leaving the Communist Party won you the sympathy of many people at the time, but it also upset many. Whose support are you counting on in the elections?

[Yeltsin] A difficult question. After all, I was in the CPSU for 30 years, and for nearly 20 of those years I was engaged in party work. And, I will tell you frankly: It was not easy for me to make the decision to leave the party. All the same, I am sure that many people—both Communists and nonparty people—understood my action: Can it be right for the Supreme Soviet chairman to be dependent on the Central Committee of a party, still less to rate its instructions above all the laws, above the Constitution? I made my choice, and I do not regret it. Whose support am I counting on? The support of those who understand me, who share my views.

[Lynev] Your position on the question of national sovereignties is well known, and not everyone takes the same view of it. Remember, for instance, the Russian-speaking population in a number of Union republics. In this connection, what guarantees are there that the civil rights of this section of the population will be observed?

[Yeltsin] First, tanks and violence cannot be the guarantees.

People originally from Russia live in all the republics of the Union. And we are not abandoning our citizens living elsewhere to the whim of fate. The most important and natural guarantee for them is the maintenance of durable, all-around relations between Russia and the other republics. These must be built on a reliable legal grounds. Incidentally, since the conclusion of Russia's bilateral treaties with Latvia and Estonia the parliaments of those republics have begun to change articles in certain laws that did indeed infringe the rights of the nonindigenous population.

The most important condition of the durability of guarantees to our citizens is integrity in interethnic policy.

Any kind of game or speculation with interethnic problems is impermissible. I also want to remind you that we are not pioneers when it comes to settling interethnic questions. Mankind has been tackling this problem for centuries, and has accumulated enormous experience. Unfortunately, for a long time we looked down on that experience or brushed it aside. The time has come to assimilate it intensively, along with the norms of international law.

[Lynev] But the problem of sovereignties does not end here. For Russia and a number of its national formations, the problem is probably only just beginning. How do you see the solution? As what kind of state do you picture the Russia of the future—a federation, a confederation?

[Yeltsin] Our approach to the resolution of this problem is the same—no violence or coercion, but a quest for consensus through dialogue. As for the Russian Federation, I think we are on the right path in formulating the optimum model for its future. A Federal Treaty is currently in preparation. Supreme Soviet deputies and representatives of Russia's republics, and also the autonomous formations, oblasts, and krais, are involved. Together we are working out a model for a Russian Federation whose members also belong to the Union. The republics correspondingly delegate some of their powers to Russia and some to the Union. The responsibility is divided in the same way. This correlation is not imposed from above. Tataria takes a different view of this. But I do not want to overdramatize this difference of opinion. Consultations are under way with the republic's leadership. I am sure we will find a mutually acceptable solution.

[Lynev] What do you think, did the CPSU have a real chance, at one time, of becoming the party of reform, the vanguard of perestroika? Did it miss its chance?

[Yeltsin] I think it did have a chance. But then the party began to suffer a disastrous loss of prestige, and this was prompted by several factors. First and foremost, neither the strategy nor the tactics of perestroika was scientifically substantiated. Hence the appearance of first one set of directions, then another, and these not infrequently turned into misdirections. An important milestone was the campaign for the elections of USSR people's deputies. It was at this stage that the CPSU—or, to be precise, the main bulk of its leadership both centrally and locally—adopted a conservative stance, campaigning against democratically inclined candidates for people's deputies. It was from that time that the party's prestige began to decline. Then a sharp deterioration in the economic situation began, and the party failed to react correctly to it and was plunged into confusion, which also did not exactly boost its prestige. I said more than once at plenums: We are wasting time. We are dragging our heels over the reforms. You know what the reaction was. In short, I am afraid the CPSU lost its chance. And now a further decline lies in store for it. Although just

recently there have been some interesting developments here, in the direction of renewal.

[Lynev] You are talking about the "Communists for Democracy" movement?

[Yeltsin] Yes, the movement whose formation was announced at the Third Congress of Russian People's Deputies by A. Rutskoy—who, as you know, is a candidate for the Russian vice presidency. I think this movement opens up interesting prospects for many Communists who have done their duty honorably for many years, but were unable to take responsibility for the party as a whole, for its leadership. While wishing to dissociate themselves from the residue of the past, these Communists were still reluctant to up and leave the party just like that. Some of them were held by tradition and discipline, and some—you have to understand this—owe their position to the party. The option we are talking about is interesting because it helps these people to find their way and embark on the path of renewal. And they are being pushed onto that path, quite unintentionally, by those party leaders who have still learned nothing.

Let me remind you how, during the elections of USSR people's deputies, in a certain regiment of the Moscow garrison they issued the order to vote for Brakov, and backed it up with a Sunday dinner—with everything as it should be; but when they opened the ballot boxes, they found that 100 percent voted for Yeltsin.

So putting pressure on people is counterproductive—it is time people grasped that. But no, recently a coded message went around the KGB again: Vote for Ryzhkov, against Yeltsin. I called [KGB Chairman] Kryuchkov and I said to him: Vladimir Aleksandrovich, what kind of state are we living in? Are we civilized, or not? Kryuchkov admitted it was a disgrace, and assured me he would look into it at the collegium, and find out who issued this coded message. But you see: Symptoms of the old disease are unfortunately recurring. And they put people off.

[Lynev] But what about the Ryzhkov-Gromov duo itself, how strong do you think it is?

[Yeltsin] Whatever anyone may say, in the end N.I. Ryzhkov is the center's candidate. Of course, the military-industrial complex is behind him. That is a powerful organization. I do not want to say anything about Ryzhkov himself. I tell my agents: I do not want any Yeltsin-Ryzhkov confrontations. Although people love a confrontation. For instance, one of the leaders of the Vyatka Soviet sent an article to the local newspaper—without my knowledge, of course—favorably comparing Yeltsin with Bakatin. And he did it, as people often do in our country, without pulling his punches. But Bakatin was first secretary there, in Vyatka. Not for long, but even so, they had experience with him. He is a business-like man. I have great respect for him. Incidentally, he called me not long ago and assured me that come what may he would not campaign against me, and I told him: That's my principle too. We understood each other.

So this hard-hitting campaigning against Bakatin only helped him, in my opinion, to collect the necessary 100,000 votes. I think it is clear what this proves: How violently allergic to injustice our people are.

[Lynev] Unfortunately, we also have to talk about hitches and mistakes in our democratic, radical movement, which can be explained in terms of its youth. Such as this: Because of its radicalism, has it not created difficulties in finding a compromise with the more moderate section of society, which to some extent narrows the base of democracy and restricts the potential for a "roundtable?"

[Yeltsin] I think it is important to focus on what is most important here: Partial reforms, implemented gradually, will destroy us. The people will not stand for it. When people say it is logical to extend the reforms over a period of years—that is not for us. That is for a society where a tolerable living standard has already been achieved, and where the people can wait a while. In our country, the situation is so critical, plus the bureaucratic system is so powerful, that we must put an end to them not gradually, but radically. It is another matter that from the viewpoint of organizing the democratic movement and winning people over to it, the democrats should indeed be a little more moderate, stop frightening people off (because many people are afraid of destroying what we already have) with ultraleft speeches, and move toward the center, that is how I would put it. That would help to consolidate the democratic movement more. Although I think that since April there has been a shift in this direction. This emerged as a response to the "winter offensive" by the right. And it was thanks to the democratic movement, the workers' movement, the strike movement, that the opportunity arose for the 23 April meeting and the well-known Nine plus One agreement. I think that at that moment the president realized that it is necessary to lean over—from the center, perhaps, but still to lean on the left shoulder, because that is the way to move forward. And that was what gave rise to the constructive nature of the Nine plus One agreement.

[Lynev] But was not this important agreement a case of two sides meeting each other halfway—the center and the republics?

[Yeltsin] I think the president yielded more than the republics' representatives. But the main point—you are right about that—is that the agreement became possible on the basis of a common compromise. I gave a full appraisal of the significance of that during my visit to Czechoslovakia. This was my first official visit in 11 months. It was a success. During the visit I realized that we—and that includes the Union leadership—were wrong to neglect the East European countries. After all, this market has been developing for decades. We have many links, so do we suddenly break it all off? What for? For whose benefit? And it became clear to me, from my talks with Havel, Dubcek, and other Czech and Slovak leaders, to what extent our neighbors were worried about our instability, the war of laws, the confrontation. But

the statement by the "Ten" encouraged them. They sensed that now contacts can be developed. Although, of course, on an entirely different basis from before.

[Lynev] What do you think: From whom and in what form is there a threat to the Nine plus One agreement?

[Yeltsin] There is a threat to the agreement, and it is a real one—from the opponents of reform, the supporters of a state of emergency, and they have recently shown themselves clearly. But I would also like to say something else: The process that the agreement of the "Ten" started off, also has strong defense mechanisms. These are cooperation between the center and the republic, and the center and democratic forces. Of course you cannot simplify this issue, but I am optimistic about the prospects for this agreement.

[Lynev] Recently it has become a common phenomenon for statesmen and politicians to be present at church ceremonies broadcast on television. Seeing this, both believers and nonbelievers ask the following question: Why have our leaders, including Yeltsin, turned to God and is it for real?

[Yeltsin] I will speak for myself. First, I was baptized. My name and date of birth were recorded in the church book, as is proper. My grandparents were believers. My mother and father were believers until we moved from the countryside to the city. But later, at school and at the institute, when I was receiving my education—which in our country is ideologized beyond measure—I constantly heard, read, and—what is the point of hiding it—absorbed and shared the most abusive assessments of the church and religion. Of course this was a great mistake and an injustice. As is dividing people into believers and nonbelievers. Indeed, this division has only been slightly relaxed now.

Nevertheless, I have a profound respect for the Orthodox Church, its history, its contribution to Russian spirituality, morality, and the tradition of charity and philanthropy—and now the church's role in this is being restored. It is our duty, for our part, to restore the church's rights.

I often meet with the patriarchs of Moscow and All-Russia and other clergy. If I am in a church I will light a candle, and a four-hour service does not bother me at all. Neither my wife nor I. And in general, when I come out of a church, I feel that there is something new and radiant within me.

Nevertheless, I cannot cross myself in public. Something stops me. It is probably that you cannot believe halfheartedly. In general this process, the toil of the soul, progresses and comes into being in as complex a way as the reappraisal of totalitarianism did in its time.

[Lynev] In the past, you were not an unimportant person in the party, so do you not feel guilty before the people today for things that happened?

[Yeltsin] Yes, I certainly do.

[Lynev] In your office there is not a single portrait of a leader; in this respect you have also made a break with tradition.

[Yeltsin] This goes back to the time when I became first secretary of the Moscow Party Committee, and I occupied V. Grishin's office, where there was a whole iconostasis on the walls—from the founders of Marxism to well-known Marxists from Brezhnev's times. During the first refurbishment I asked that only Lenin's portrait remain. I also found it here in the new premises. But if I was to distance myself from clichés that prevented me from looking at life in an unprejudiced way, then I had to make a decision about the portrait. In the end, if you really want a picture, it is better to hang up a good one so that your soul and eyes can relax.

[Lynev] We have spoken about politics and even religion. Meanwhile economic problems are acquiring particular significance. Take the following: 70 percent of the Russian industrial potential is in the defense enterprises. In your opinion, is it possible to construct a full market on the basis of the remaining 30 percent? What about the 70 percent in that case? Should we continue to finance this sector, with our budget deficits, or should we grant it the possibility of transferring to the market in an independent fashion?

[Yeltsin] The economy is a single organism. This means that you cannot have a market economy in one individual sector or one individual territory. The Russian program to stabilize the economy and transfer to market relations contains a chapter devoted to the defense complex. Of course the transfer of the military-industrial complex to the market will have its own features. We intend to provide incentives for the transition of enterprises in the military-industrial complex from direct budget financing to a system of orders from the Defense Ministry (including a mechanism for competition), and pursue a license policy on export output for military-industrial enterprises.

The most effective options for conversion are now being worked out, taking into account both our own and foreign experience. The fact that highly skilled personnel is concentrated in the defense sector and the latest world-standard technologies are in use there is also being borne in mind. We must not lose them. However, the point here is that the defense industry is at the moment under the Union's authority, and of course it is not really our place to carry out reforms there. However, I hope that the dialogue that has started with the Union leadership will help us reach mutually advantageous decisions.

[Lynev] Another issue concerns the basic sectors, and in particular the raw materials sectors. As we know, the miners have managed to get free prices for part of their output and an increase in their earnings. As for the prices on oil and gas, they are remaining stable, while the position of the population of the oil producing regions is hopeless. What is going to happen here?

[Yeltsin] I will give a short answer. The decisions that were reached for the coal sector are fully applicable in the oil and gas production sectors and other sectors. If you grant people economic freedom and give them support, they will solve their own problems.

[Lynev] We are spending currency on buying grain across the ocean and we are sinking deeper into debt although it is becoming increasingly difficult for us to obtain currency. At the same time our enterprises are not in a position to complete thousands of combines and this is threatening to ruin the next grain harvest, which promises to be quite a good one. As a presidential candidate, what solution do you see here? When, in your opinion, will this humiliation of Russia and the Russians end?

[Yeltsin] Today all the reasons for the deep agrarian crisis are being discovered, as are ways out of it. The attention of the Second Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, which started off the profound agrarian transformations in the republic, was focused on this question.

We will not put an end to the food problem until the people who work on the land become its real masters. Millions of people have a tremendous desire to return to the land even now, when assistance is extremely limited. And often, instead of assistance, artificial obstacles are created. Nevertheless, we firmly intend to help the re-emerging peasantry. I believe that the land they receive will not become overgrown with weeds. About this year's harvest. The sowing is progressing quite well. But it is most likely that fall will be difficult. The kolkhozes and sovkhoses will probably have to be helped.

[Lynev] Thank you for your replies.

[Yeltsin] For my part I would like to wish IZVESTIYA readers prosperity and happiness. I hope that we will often meet again on the pages of your newspaper.

Yeltsin Expresses Views on Russian Communists

LD2305212291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1644 GMT 23 May 91

[From the "Parliamentary Diary" program presented by Vladimir Korablev]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Korablev] We have already reported that the work of the Fourth Congress of People's Deputies of Russia is being covered by a large group of Soviet and foreign journalists. Today, during a break, an improvised news conference was held by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, in the corridors of the Great Kremlin Palace.

[Begin recording] [Yeltsin] I have great respect for Communists, who have given much in the way of their intellect, strength, and heart, and who have worked conscientiously and continue to do so. Basically, I always

talk in this respect against the party apparatus. The fact that Rutskoy has now become head of this movement of Communists for Democracy gives very many Communists a moral way out of the situation. Because on the one hand they do not want to bear this burden of the CPSU from the past, and on the other hand they do not want to leave the CPSU for various reasons, because of convictions, and because of tradition, and besides (?other) complications may arise. But this is certainly a compromise with themselves.

[Correspondent Vladimir Perfilyev] Rutskoy has said that he was extremely... [changes thought] even shocked, by your proposal.

[Yeltsin] Well, I had five people. I analyzed each one's pluses and minuses and came to the conclusion, nonetheless, that this is a person of innovative [netraditsionnykh] decisions. And this is one more innovative decision that may attract that category of people which today does not totally support me, I would express myself in these mild terms. [end recording]

[Korablev] One more interview by Vladimir Perfilyev, our correspondent, with Dmitriy Antonovich Volkogonov, RSFSR people's deputy, in which he shares his thoughts on the elections of the first president of the Russian Federation.

[Begin recording] [Perfilyev] [passage omitted] Dmitriy Antonovich, currently a struggle is under way for the candidates, for the future president. Whose side are your sympathies on?

[Volkogonov] I think that there will be—in my view—there will be three basic candidates. I think there will be Comrade Yeltsin, Ryzhkov, and Bakatin. I think they are the most serious candidates. But I won't hide the fact that my sympathies are on the side of the person who today embodies democratic changes. And it is not a question of personalities. Boris Nikolayevich has deficiencies and weaknesses. His main positive characteristics are that he is constantly learning. He has matured very well over these two years. But the main thing is that today he embodies the striving of our society toward democratic changes and democratic reforms, and not attempts to turn us onto the old path, which is observable in the programs of certain other candidates. I think that the people will express their opinion themselves on this account.

[Perfilyev] Thank you for the interview. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Ryzhkov Presidential Platform Outlined

LD2305215891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1900 GMT 23 May 91

[Text] Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, candidate for president of Russia, gave details of his election platform when speaking to the electorate in the Krasnogorsk Palace of

Culture in Moscow Oblast. He announced that his election strategy consists of fighting for the votes of all social categories. The main theses of the program are as follows:

- immediate signing of the Union and federation treaties;
- working out a special legislative act which would precisely record the status of the Russian Federation and defend the rights of the Russian-speaking population outside the federation;
- wage indexation;
- reducing the prices of main food products and essential consumer goods.

Bakatin News Conference on Candidacy Cited

PM2305150791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 May 91 Second Edition p 3

[V. Khatuntsev report: "Contender's Creed"]

[Text] As is well known, V. Bakatin has been named as one of the contenders for Russian president and has chosen R. Abdulatipov as his running mate. Yesterday they held a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists.

Talking about his election program, Bakatin stressed that he holds to a commonsense philosophy and is not a supporter of populism. The work to restructure Russia and the entire country should be based on the principles of consensus rather than confrontation between different political forces. A house that is divided cannot stand, and a country where people are going head to head with each other cannot survive. It would be better if work and order were to prevail.

Pondering on how, as the contender put it, to rid Russia of the shell of obsolescent structures, Vadim Viktorovich defined the main avenues of his program. There is room in it for the transition to the market, for improving citizens' social protection, and for privatization—which should not be enforced under any circumstances. Touching on the question of interethnic relations, the contender stressed that it is time to adopt a declaration on the safety of all citizens, wherever they may live. Bakatin said: "If the law requires that a contender suspend his membership of the CPSU, I will do so."

Bakatin Campaign for Presidency Viewed

PM2305135791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 23 May 91 p 1

[I. Sichka report: "Things Are Moving"]

[Text] The Russian congress yesterday adopted the Law "On the RSFSR President" and ratified the last candidate.

The law is my god, Vadim Bakatin said, reaffirming his readiness to suspend his membership of the CPSU if the legislators so require.

Addressing journalists, RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] presidential contender Vadim Bakatin reported that no one party or social organization is involved in his nomination and election campaign. Although he makes no secret of the fact that he turned to certain structures (specifically, the Children's Fund) for help, but was refused.

At the same time, it is clear from other statements he has made that not all kinds of help are acceptable to him. Thus, the news that, as part of the nomination procedure, Bakatin's candidacy would be discussed at the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee plenum produced a negative reaction from him. He does not want to represent this party. In the same way, incidentally, as Nikolay Ryzhkov, who received official support at the same plenum. However, whereas Ryzhkov, judging by reports, is making extensive use of the potential afforded by the party apparatus in his campaign, Bakatin has already started experiencing a certain amount of opposition. Admittedly, he did not specify from what quarter, promising to make a separate statement later.

It is curious to note that V. Bakatin left his position as a member of the Security Council on entering the election campaign. However, M. Gorbachev has not yet stated his attitude to him.

Vadim Bakatin's election program is moderately radical. He stressed his unconditional adherence to market relations and the USSR's broad integration into the world economic community. And he advocates cutting military spending, introducing a rigid economy regime, giving priority to the development of land reform (peasants should obtain land on a perpetual basis), and accelerating housing construction.

The candidate was brief on the subject of relations with autonomous entities: "The autonomous entities should be given rights to the extent that they do not disrupt the Russian state's integrity." As for Union republics which do not want to sign the new Union treaty—that, the Russian presidential contender believes, is their unconditional right.

Vadim Bakatin espouses, as he put it, a "commonsense philosophy." He believes his potential voters will be people who find extreme radicalism of both right and left alien to them.

Presidential Candidate Tuleyev Interviewed

LD2205162991

[Editorial Report] Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian at 0500 GMT on 22 May carries a 20-minute program, with musical interludes, interviewing Aman Tuleyev, Kemerovo Oblast Soviet chairman and Russian presidential candidate, hosted by announcer Yuriy Semenov.

Semenov begins by saying: "Today we have the first of a series of meetings live on the air with the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] presidential candidates. With me here in the studio is Aman-geldy Moldagazyevich Tuleyev, chairman of the Kemerovo Oblast Soviet and Executive Committee."

Tuleyev begins by explaining the differences in the way his name as published: He is known familiarly as Aman Gumirovich, and prefers this form of address. His mother is a Tatar, his father a Kazakh, but he was brought up by a Russian stepfather, and his education was Russian. He hopes this will pre-empt comments that the president of the RSFSR should be a Russian, since there are over 100 nations and nationalities in the RSFSR. Tuleyev is 47, by profession a railway engineer, and permanently resides in Siberia. Having summarized his own career, he talks about his running-mate "Bocharov, but not the Bocharov in the Higher Economic Council, it's Viktor Ivanovich Bocharov, who will indeed be just as well-known as the other Bocharov, no doubt about it." Bocharov's chief characteristic, according to Tuleyev, is that he is "a clever, business-like, creative man who knows what to do and how to do it."

Asked about his program, Tuleyev says: "Well, what I think is this: What does a program mean? Frankly, I'm positively sick of all these programs, there are so many of them. And the main thing is—why? As the chairman of a soviet, I'm the man through whom all these programs pass first, and I am obliged to implement these programs in my own region. What do people want today? What do I want? First, the opportunity to earn, to earn for themselves, I repeat, enough for a worthy life, not a poverty-stricken life, but a worthy one, and, of course, by honest and conscientious labor. Whatever I can earn, so be it. Then I want to have the opportunity of buying everything I need with my earnings."

Parents should not have to fear for their children, nor children for their parents. There must be good air and natural environs, and the opportunity to educate one's children and grandchildren, to bring them up physically and morally healthy. One's old age, Tuleyev says, must also be taken care of. "The Union and Russia must be preserved, all the same, from disintegration; and one must live longer. That's the whole human program," and it is in the way of implementing such a program that the differences between the presidential candidates lie.

Questions coming in from listeners include Tuleyev's attitude toward the workers' movement in Kuzbass, which he declares should be supported insofar as it is constructive, not destructive; and his intentions for the election campaign, which he declares is geared to how well-known the candidates are, so the date set creates absurdly unequal conditions.

After a musical interlude, listeners' questions continue: Asked his attitude to his rivals in the presidential campaign, Tuleyev says he has respect for them. Asked to

comment briefly on why he chose to stand against Yeltsin, since some people say the aim is to take votes away from Yeltsin, Tuleyev says: "Well, if it has to be a brief reply, the fact is that politics has always been a dirty affair in Russia. In the present case, I am getting into it with my hands clean; I don't play those sorts of games. Once I've decided to go ahead, go ahead I shall. But I shall go ahead until I see that people back me; if they don't back me I shall make my own decision. But as for quitting in favor of someone else in the race—that's out!"

After more music, the interview resumes, with listeners showing more interest than interviewer Semenov had expected. Asked if he is a member of the CPSU, Tuleyev says: "Yes, I'm a communist," and declares the prospective regulation whereby the RSFSR president must give up membership in the CPSU to be against the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which asserts that everyone may belong to associations and organizations. "But the law's the law. If the law's adopted, I'll obey it." Commenting on his program for interethnic relations in the RSFSR, Tuleyev says that the national-state structure is somewhat "confused" in Russia today, with no definition of the okrugs, oblasts, and so on. This should be sorted out and resources allocated, though Tuleyev does not go into details. There should be a special program to aid those members of national groups residing outside Russia.

Tuleyev is simultaneously chairman of the soviet and of the executive committee, Semenov points out: Is he therefore in favor of reorganization of the administrative structure? Tuleyev enthusiastically backs the idea of simplifying the local soviet system, reducing the body of deputies, and putting them on a paid professional basis. The soviets must be linked closely with presidential rule, with popularly elected chairmen of oblast soviets being members of the presidential council, and therefore representing the president at the local level.

Tuleyev thanks a listener for good wishes, since "so far I've only had criticism and distrust," and backs an idea for the unsuccessful presidential candidates to be on the presidential council, since they would represent popular votes. Semenov mentions other listeners' comments: hopes that Tuleyev is not elected, since he is such a popular oblast leader; and appeals for him not to give up his candidacy.

Ending the interview, Semenov reminds listeners that this is the first such meeting with RSFSR presidential candidates, and says that the format may be changed depending on listeners' responses. "We plan to invite here everyone who has been officially registered, and we shall announce the time of the meetings as they arise—since, as you will understand, the meetings depend on when the candidates can make it." Semenov ends by wishing Tuleyev "success in the difficult campaign he has entered."

Presidential Candidate Ryzhkov Interviewed

91UN1495A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA
in Russian 14 May 91 pp 1-2

[Interview with RSFSR presidential candidate Nikolay I. Ryzhkov, by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA political commentator Yuriy Makartsev; place and date not given: "If I Become the President of Russia...."]

[Text] Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov speaks on what motivated his comeback to big politics; on Russia; on leaders with "room to grow"; on events that are still fresh in the memory of each of us; and on his readiness to conduct a dialog with the opponents on both the "right" and the "left." His interviewer is RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA political commentator Yuriy Makartsev.

To Hand Yeltsin the Power "on a Platter?" This Is Not Going To Work

[Makartsev] Nikolay Ivanovich! So, the rumors had it right: You really are ready to challenge Boris Yeltsin—and anyone else who is brave enough—at the presidential elections in Russia?! I must confess that we had these thoughts: Ryzhkov has abandoned the "political track," leaving it to other hunters, and has now turned to managing the family economics, nursing his grandchildren, and going to a sauna on Saturdays.... Well, it is a common thing in world practice for a politician to enter the same river twice. As to us, could you explain which ambitious string in your character sounded again, calling you to this crazy life?

[Ryzhkov] Let us make it so that you and I can have a frank conversation. By the way, I have always preferred frankness over craftiness and innuendoes—a trait that has cost me dearly in my lifetime.

You probably heard what happened to me not too long ago: I became ill. Actually, this was the first time in my life that I was seriously ill—until then, my being had successfully managed the stresses, with the exception of short-lived colds that sometimes took me away from work. As is known, convalescence puts people in a philosophic mood. I, too, started thinking: What next?

I am 61 years old, I reasoned to myself; I feel normal, do not seem to have lost a taste for active life. In any case, how can one simply drop out of reality where passions are seething, where a struggle is going on, and the fate of the country is being decided, and, most importantly, where you yourself only recently were one of the major players. I spent the last eight years in the political life of the country. I am not even talking about my earlier career—it is well known. First, the 25 years at the Ural Machine Building Works, then here, in Moscow—in the economic job in the ministry, in the USSR State Planning Committee, and in the CPSU Central Committee. No, I thought, it does not look like I would be able to just stay at home, read books—this is my favorite pastime—and watch the development of complex life collisions on television. I should look for a job....

Meanwhile, a job was looking for me. I have accumulated a whole folder at home full of letters from friends and proposals from organizations and associations; people remembered me, invited me, counted on my professional abilities. Most likely, upon full recovery I would have found an occupation for myself with the help of that folder or in some other way....

Then the Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies adopted a decision on the presidency in the republic. And some time later I started hearing from directors of enterprises, representatives of public organizations, and individuals. Asking: Would you, Nikolay Ivanovich, agree to go on a ballot as a candidate for the post of the president of Russia? I started thinking. Yes, this is quite different from, let us say, my potential decision to head a large industrial association. First of all, an enormous election campaign. If I do accept this challenge, it would be with the aim of winning. And the presidential bread is hard-earned, too, I contemplated.

You understand, I am not a novice in the structure of power; I know what it costs. You will ask: Do I like the power itself; have I gotten used to it as head of the USSR Council of Ministers? I think not. I have tested myself: I can easily do without power; I do not feel the itch to, by whatever means, be "at the top." I do not feel a spiritual discomfort without an official post. Honestly.

I took time reflecting on it. I kept asking myself: You were standing at the origins of perestroika, together with others, in 1985—are you happy with the way the situation is developing in the Union and in Russia in 1991? The situation in the country, in my opinion, is critical. And it is getting worse. If it gets worse we are facing a social explosion. It is no better in Russia. The new leadership has been at the helm for almost a year now—but what are the results? There is a confrontation between the republic and the "center." Comrade Yeltsin and Comrade Gorbachev are involved in personal squabbles, while enterprises stop; the cost of living goes up, and the life of ordinary people becomes increasingly difficult.

If Yeltsin and "his team"—this is my opinion—remain in power and continue the same policy, it is unlikely that the life of people in Russia will change for the better. To hand Yeltsin the power just like that, "on a platter?" No, it should not be done; it cannot be done. After long deliberations, I decided that my civic duty is to jump into this struggle for the post of president.

[Makartsev] He who shies away from the fight loses it—I think Cardinal Richelieu said that. You have already discussed your motives in the press, Nikolay Ivanovich. Still, since we are having this frank conversation: Was there not some "court intrigue" that contributed to your comeback to the political scene of Russia? Perhaps, in one of those days when you were immersed in your complex deliberations, Gorbachev or Polozkov called you to the office and put some pressure on your party

conscience? You have, Nikolay Ivanovich—they might have said—to fight for the chair of Russia! Or—what?

[Ryzhkov] No, Gorbachev did not know anything.... I did not consult with him personally, or the Supreme Soviet, or the CPSU Central Committee, before making my decision. But, of course, rumors do circulate, and the president does have good access to information....

On 1 May, after the rally on Red Square, I went to the Kremlin with a group of comrades. At that very moment Gorbachev came down from the viewing stand. We exchanged holiday greetings. "I hear some talk..." said the president. "Yes," I confirmed. "I have given my consent to participate in the Russian elections."

"Then—good luck!" the president wished me.

I do not want to say that I am someone special; I do not overestimate my strength; the people know my pluses and minuses. Yeltsin, Ryzhkov, Bakatin, others—let it be ten candidates. Let it be a true political race; let our people figure out who stands on what position and who deserves to be entrusted with the leadership of Russia. If people like Yeltsin's position better, then they will probably elect him. I personally think that Boris Nikolayevich's position is groundless. I think we should not simply give power to a person who has not made any substantial contribution to the development of Russia, or to the strengthening of the Union for that matter. Thus, my decision is firm and conscious. If people trust me; if they nominate me, then I will say firmly: I will not withdraw my candidacy.

[Makartsev] *RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA* recently published a list of potential candidates for the post of the president of Russia; among others, there were the following names: Yeltsin, Ryzhkov, Bakatin, Sobchak, Fedorov, Petrakov, and others. A modest opinion poll conducted by the newspaper placed you, Nikolay Ivanovich, in second place after Yeltsin in the readers' ratings. The second—this is great, but still, it is the second, and it is after Yeltsin. Are you not afraid that you are knowingly embarking on a hopeless undertaking? It can create both a physical and a spiritual overload....

[Ryzhkov] Of course, I am human, and I am not free from human frailties, as they say. If I lose, I will not make a tragedy out of my defeat; I will feel that I have fulfilled my civic duty. Yeltsin, Ryzhkov, Bakatin—some will necessarily lose; there is only one position of president. However, the mere fact of a race for this post shows that during the last two or three years we started getting on the road of civilized development of society, and this is good. When the USSR Council of Ministers was liquidated, I did not faint, nor did I develop a depression because of this. In general, we should move away from the idea of "lifetime leadership:" once one was appointed to a high government post, it was until the heart stopped beating, all the way to the "Kremlin wall."

Resignations—including those on a voluntary basis—are a norm of any developed democratic society; they should become our norm as well.

[Makartsev] Do you not think, Nikolay Ivanovich, that we have a shortage of leaders? There seems to be so many names of political figures and people's deputies that are familiar to the ear, but once it comes to elections or a nomination to a high government post, we realize that we can count personalities of the "first order"—such as Gorbachev or Yeltsin—on our fingers.

[Ryzhkov] What deficit of talented personalities are you talking about? It is just that many of us have retained in our heads old notions of power and contenders for power. I have been watching the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet for a year and a half—there are so many talented deputies who have shown themselves during this time! Considering that many of them came to the Kremlin from the rallying streets, without preparation, and without an understanding of what the state is and how to run it. A number of them are acquiring leadership qualities right before our eyes.

Both Yeltsin and I are over 60; according to the Constitution, if one of us is elected president, he will be able to stay head of the Russian state for only one term. However, I am convinced that by the next presidential election new, bright political figures will emerge, and they will come not through the "nomenklatura" system of cadre selection—they will be pushed "up" by life itself.

[Makartsev] About a year and a half ago, Anatoly Aleksandrovich Sobchak gave me an exam during my interview with him: Whom among the ministers of the Russian Government could I name off the top of my head. And it is true, the RSFSR rulers appeared in the eyes of citizens of Russia as some kind of a "faceless conglomerate of official personae." Now we have Silayev, Khasbulatov, Bocharov, Solomin, Skokov... and, of course, Yeltsin! Many citizens of the republic trust Yeltsin and, possibly, will vote for him. You know Boris Nikolayevich well; what are, in your opinion, his strong and weak points as a politician and a statesman, or just as a human being?

[Ryzhkov] I have known Comrade Yeltsin since a long time: We are both from Sverdlovsk, where he worked in the CPSU obkom [oblast committee], while I was at Uralmash. When Yeltsin became first secretary of Sverdlovsk Obkom, I had already moved to Moscow. Later Yeltsin, too, moved to the capital: A career as a CPSU Central Committee secretary on construction, and then later as a first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom [city party committee] awaited him here; our paths crossed again many times.

He was expected to bring order to Moscow, but he had made very few practical steps. There were more populist moves in order to strengthen his positions—this was always Yeltsin's hallmark. I will not go into the details of his biography; much of it is well known. I do think that

it was a mistake not to make public in a timely manner the materials of the CPSU Central Committee plenum where Yeltsin was relieved of his duties as the first secretary of Moscow Gorkom. This brought him the publicity of a martyr and a fighter: He seems to be the only one who sees the shortcomings of perestroika; everybody else is a conservative, they either do not understand anything, or else keep silent out of fear.

In my opinion, Yeltsin has not left the significant imprint of a leader after having been in charge of construction for two years as a USSR minister. It seems that in those years he stopped doing practical work entirely, went into a political fight, and developed a taste for confrontation. And how did he show himself after becoming a chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Construction? He did not do anything particularly outstanding there, either—if we compare it to the fruitful work of other committees of the Supreme Soviet.

During the last year we saw Yeltsin at the helm of Russia. Of course, it is impossible to turn life around in one year—I know myself how inert everything is in our economy and in the social sphere. However, for Yeltsin this year passed under the banner of an extremely embittered fight against the "center." Yes, there was such a notion circulated—that we ostensibly have this malicious and isolated center—the state, with its plants and factories, and with its power, which is the source of all Russia's troubles.

In my opinion, Yeltsin as a politician is unpredictable; also, he often lacks political flexibility. A high caliber political leader must, of course, be firm and decisive. Still, political life in many respects is built on compromises. With Yeltsin, it is this way: Any other point of view often will not move him an inch.

Following Yeltsin's political career, one cannot help but notice that his line of action at the national level does not coincide with his line of action at the republic level. As if there were two different people who took these actions and made these decisions. Yes, I am unquestionably for the sovereignty of Russia. I said that back in 1987, when we were working on the economic reform package in the USSR Council of Ministers. It became clear then that we would get nowhere by vertical economic modernization and that republics and regions needed to be given independence and special rights. However, rights should be balanced by obligations; we are only strong when we are one big state—the Union.

Unfortunately, the process of sovereignization of the territories got out of control. The announced supremacy of republic laws—made without sufficient deliberation—has led to an all-out war of the laws. In such a situation, no matter whether it was Yeltsin at the helm of the republic, or Ryzhkov, or someone else—the power would be as loose as a car steering with too much slack: Chaos, instability, and confrontation are inevitable. The important point is that by encouraging the war of laws

Yeltsin is running the risk of having the same unstable situation in Russia as we have today in the Union.

The leadership of Russia and Yeltsin himself are playing with fire, and this brings out civic concern in me. This is also, I must note, one of the reasons why I agreed to become a presidential candidate.

"O, Russia, Flap Your Wings,

Set Up Different Timbering!

With Different Names,

A Different Steppe Arises!"

Sergey Yesenin, February 1917

[Makartsev] Nikolay Ivanovich! One cannot say this about all Russian public figures of the new times, but there is no question that for some of them love for Russia is an "acquired" one; it is pragmatic and preconditioned by a parliamentary democracy. Of course, love for Russia that is rooted in a Russian and Russia's self-consciousness, whose origins are in the spirituality and traditions of ancestors—from Ivan Kalita to Peter the Great, from Tolstoy and Chekhov to Solzhenitsyn and Rasputin—this is a subject for a separate conversation. What is Russia to you, Nikolay Ivanovich? Or has the faith in it also emerged "impromptu," as a necessary argument of the current political situation?

[Ryzhkov] My attitude toward Russia—both from the state and political point of view and the moral one—is not dictated by any topical considerations. As if I decided to go for its presidency and immediately started loving it. This is the center around which a large and great Soviet Union has evolved. The standard of living in the republics shows a differential of two to two and a half times; the lowest one is in Russia, since—as a result of certain ideological notions—the republic has been receiving little, not enough, from the common pie. Russia is a state of bad roads, squalid structures, and empty stores—this is the sad reality of the republic. It was shortchanged in a political sense, too: she did not have her own communist party or state structures that existed in, for instance, Belorussia or Ukraine.... Nevertheless, one cannot be happy alone; in resurrecting Russia, we cannot lose the Union as a whole....

[Makartsev] Are you not afraid, Nikolay Ivanovich, that in the course of the election campaign your opponents will not let your love for Russia be heard; that is, they will say at the rallies, the same Ryzhkov who put in opposition the interests of Russia and the center.

[Ryzhkov] I did not put them in opposition. I cannot accept the accusation that we have implemented some kind of a conscious policy that denigrated Russia. There was simply not enough strength and resources to put the republic economy firmly on its feet. Still, we did not leave our Russia completely untended. For example, I personally was one of the authors of the program "The Roads of Non-Chernozem." We selected 29 oblasts and

found 35 billion rubles to build roads. We created construction organizations and got the military involved.... A drop in a bucket? Unfortunately, this is true, because Russia is big and it is run down so much it hurts to see it....

I would not dare to promise an instantaneous rebirth of Russia; such assurances are populism. However, I am convinced that this big and great republic will find its road within the transformed Union. You will ask: Where is a concrete program of socioeconomic transformation for Russia? The work is in progress, I will report on it.

A Passing Grade

[Makartsev] Nikolay Ivanovich, your return into big politics sets a precedent that does not have a counterpart in recent memory. A return means associations.... Many journalists were puzzled by your interview with KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA under the rubric "A Night Call," in which you seemed to have expressed a grudge against the president for your sudden dismissal. How do you feel about this logic: Gorbachev, they say, has accomplished a great deed; he made his place in history, but now he has exhausted himself, and now he should be replaced by a new leader?

[Ryzhkov] In principle, I do not hold a grudge against the president; I do not think it was implied in the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA interview. I do have disagreements with Comrade Gorbachev, and I am ready to clarify them.

I believe that, since we decided to adopt a presidential form of governing, there should not be two executive powers in the country. This is my position, and I have enunciated it since the time I worked on the presidential council. I emphasized that we should tackle the reorganization of the USSR Council of Ministers only after the Union Treaty is signed, after the rights and responsibilities of the republics are defined—the new conditions will tell us which ministries are needed, and which will have to be eliminated.... Others agreed with me, and so did Gorbachev. On 17 November last year, however, the president announced at the Supreme Soviet that he was planning to modernize the executive branch—to liquidate the Council of Ministers and replace it with the Cabinet of Ministers. I met with Gorbachev, and I told him face-to-face: "You made haste, Mikhail Sergeyevich! In my opinion, where you needed to make haste was with the signing of the Union treaty." So, it is not a grudge; it is a disagreement with the president's actions.

As to the talk about Gorbachev's resignation... Mikhail Sergeyevich has quite a few shortcomings; he was told about them at the Central Committee plenums, at the Supreme Soviet, and at the USSR people's deputies congresses. He needs to draw conclusions from the criticisms. He is the president; he has great powers, and I believe that if he had used them decisively, people would have supported him even more. If the situation in

the country does not begin to improve, then, naturally, the talk about his resignation will not stop.

In my opinion, at this point, as we stand on the eve of signing the Union treaty and the reorganization of executive power, the president's departure would have brought even more instability in our life. This is my reply to Gorbachev's "well-wishers."

[Makartsev] Nikolay Ivanovich! Bush can afford it—to take off in the middle of the week to fly to his villa—to entertain his guests and to play tennis; in our country the head of state or of a republic is a laborer, a babysitter of squabbling nations, and a bookkeeper with an abacus standing over a budget full of holes. Some economists believe that deep in your heart you have remained an adherent of a planned-distributive economy, and started talking about a market during the last period of your stay as a prime minister because of new political circumstances and under pressure on the part of the left. Your voters will ask you in the course of election campaign about your attitude towards the market; what will be your answer?

[Ryzhkov] Was I pushed towards a market, or did I walk towards it myself? If you look at the road the country had travelled since 1986, considerable changes took place in our understanding of how to manage the country. It was a very difficult road of searching. It is easy to talk about it today, five years later, when we can see our pluses and minuses, and it is easy to criticize the mistakes. But we started the five-year period, if you remember, on the old positions. We only started feeling for a new approach in 1985-1987. Although the analytical preparation started in 1983....

Of course, one can attach some kind of labels to Ryzhkov: He is holding onto the planned-distributive system, they would say; he is not in favor of a market. But it was back in 1983, under Andropov, when I worked as a CPSU Central Committee secretary, that we created a special analytical group, digested a mass of information, searched, and tried to figure out how to modernize the national economy. Therefore, it is not accidental that, as soon as Gorbachev was elected CPSU Central Committee general secretary in March 1985, in April he presented to the public major proposals of principal importance in the economic area. These proposals were the fruits of collective work. Therefore, I think it is not quite right to accuse Ryzhkov of conservatism....

Could we, in 1985, head straight for a market, for market relations? No, strictly speaking we did not have even a theoretically developed concept of a transition to a market then. We moved close to a radical reform in 1987. It was then that the Law on State Enterprises was adopted—in those circumstances, it was not at all a bad law. Then 1990 came. Having analyzed the situation in the country, we understood that we could move into a market painlessly starting in 1993; during 1989-1992, we needed to prepare for new conditions, while still using mixed economic forms.

However, life again made its own corrections: The rigid planned-distributive system disintegrated right before our eyes, while a market has not evolved. The question arose: What to do? We started working on a new program, and in May presented it to the Supreme Soviet; to introduce a market starting in 1991. Unfortunately, the program was not truly heard then—everybody was upset by the price reform we proposed....

Those who confuse moderate-radical steps with conservatism are not quite right. Even today, there is no market per se; its infrastructure is only in a process of development: banks, commodity exchanges, and the redistribution of property that is taking place. We must move forward step by step. However, I think that even in the market economy the idea of economic planning will not die out; the practice of civilized countries in the West is a proof of that.

[Makartsev] It is now fashionable to prognosticate. What do you think of predictions of this kind: Pavlov's government is not going to last long; it will be swept away by the wave of inflation?

[Ryzhkov] Many people have an impression that the current Cabinet of Ministers headed by Pavlov is the same USSR Council of Ministers, only with a new sign. The Council of Ministers in Russia goes back to 1861; it was established by Alexander II; 130 years later this institution ceased to exist. Gorbachev rushed into this—we already talked about it; he should have left the reorganization of the executive branch until after the Union treaty is signed. As a result, we have created a transitional government. Or a provisional government—as Comrade Lukyanov characterized it.

[Makartsev] Nikolay Ivanovich! It is obvious that people may also hold you to answer for Chernobyl: Why did we not learn in time the scope of the disaster? Why did we not provide the necessary help to the people who lived in the danger zone? And why are we just now doing it? And why are we just now learning that the Chernobyl cloud had spread over a part of Russia, up to Novomoskovsk near Tula. Did you know about it? Perhaps, you were concealing something because of big politics?

[Ryzhkov] No. There were no political or economic considerations of hiding something from the people or not doing something to protect their health. I am stating this with full responsibility. You have read, perhaps, an article by V. Gubarev published two years ago in PRAVDA, in which he referred to the testimony of Academician V. Legasov, who had committed suicide. I worked together with Legasov and Velikhov in the disaster zone, as the head of the government commission. Therefore, as they say, if we do not want to believe those who are alive today, maybe we will believe the dead? We did not know many things then, did not understand many things; if there were the slightest doubts, I was leaning, by my own authority, in favor of decisions that were to the benefit of the people. It was not easy, for instance, to decide on the evacuation of

people from the 30-kilometer zone, but we decided to take this extraordinary measure: The evacuation started as soon as the commission meeting in Chernobyl ended.

We were not sparing any expense. Many people still do not know that one of the most complicated questions that had caught scientists and specialists unprepared was how to stop the spring floods from taking the radioactive dirt into the Dneper and further into other areas of the country. For several months military construction crews and meliorators were building dams and weirs, putting together complex engineering structures. "Brown spots" of radioactive contamination in Bryansk Oblast and in some other places appeared later. This is the fallout of Chernobyl; it was impossible to predict it from the outset...

I took this tragedy personally, into my heart; it cost me a lot. Nobody can reproach me and say: Here, Ryzhkov had an opportunity to do something else for the safety of the people, but did not do it. My conscience is clear.

Political Tastes Differ, but the Law Is the Same for All

[Makartsev] Nikolay Ivanovich! Of course, the political culture in our country often shows its rudimentary level of development; sometimes it is simply ridiculous: if you are for Yeltsin, this means you belong with the left; if you are for Gorbachev—you are a centrist; and there is nothing else to ask. I have heard you being characterized as a conservative, with this word carrying a certain negative meaning. Although, as we know, conservatism in the multiparty structure of civilized countries has earned its place under the sun and is respected—remember, for instance, Thatcher. What would you yourself say about your political orientation?

[Ryzhkov] I am leaning more towards centrism, although I do see a great social usefulness to radicals in political and economic life. The more serious among them are generators of ideas, although the country, perhaps, cannot grasp them right away. Without conservatives, political harmony is not possible, either: They are the keepers of tradition. What practical conclusions should we draw from all this? The government should use the ideas and proposals of both the "right" and "left" parts of the society, and search for consensus for it to move forward.

[Makartsev] Yeltsin resigned from the CPSU; he advocates suspension of party membership—in particular, for officials in the highest state positions. What will you do if you are elected the president of Russia and your membership in the CPSU becomes a point for all your political opponents? Finally, as the head of the republic, you will have to—without doubt—be evenhanded in your relations with all parties: Will you find a common language with both Travkin and Polozkov?

[Ryzhkov] If I am elected the president of Russia, my duty is to go by the law and to conduct a dialog with all parties and movements. We decided to become a multiparty society; thus, love for, let us say, the RSFSR

Communist Party and confrontation with the democrats is not a way to do things. Right now there is a draft proposal for the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies, which says: The president of Russia must suspend his party membership. If this is adopted, I will comply.

Nobody Is Free From Conscience

[Makartsev] Hopefully, Nikolay Ivanovich, you have had a chance to rest a little after the crazy life of the country's prime minister. What have you been doing lately: Have you been writing memoirs—as Yeltsin and Ligachev did? It is the usual way for statesmen and politicians to wrap up their careers.

[Ryzhkov] Why—wrap up careers? Some write their memoirs while still in the office—probably to make sure that their contemporaries do not forget their deeds. I personally have not started yet. Although I do believe that sooner or later experiences need to be put on paper. But there is no need to rush with it. I do not want to follow the examples of politicians who put their memoirs on the store shelves half a year after they retire. Let the impressions and experiences settle down, become more clear—then I will take to writing.

[Makartsev] The press and the television published some materials about your personal life. I hope you do not frown upon a glass at a holiday celebration with family and friends. By the way, why did you “allow” this anti-alcohol law, which was in many respects stupid, to be put through and how did it happen that the list of forbidden drinks included, together with vodka and wine, Russians' favorite drink—beer?

[Ryzhkov] It is true that in the past, when we were offering society a program for combating drunkenness, we did separate on a state level dry wine and beer from stronger beverages. During my work at the Central Committee, I familiarized myself with the documents on the anti-alcohol campaign and I did express serious doubts as to whether everything had been taken into account, and whether the ideology of combating alcohol was correct in itself. I opposed some of the planks of the government resolution—then at the preparation stage. What kind of formula is that: If there is no vodka in the stores, people will stop drinking. Others had tried to prohibit alcohol—Sweden, Canada, and the United States; in America, it only gave the Mafia its start. I proposed avoiding drastic measures and gradually reducing the production of hard liquor; or, if the decision were to be made to go for reductions, introduce immediately a coupon-based system for selling sugar, since I could predict the rise in moonshining.

Two years later we realized that we had created a monster: the lines, the speculation, the moonshining, the addiction to toxic substances—some people started drinking anything short of shoe polish. Miners, metallurgists, and construction workers alike were sending indignant letters to the government and the Central Committee: Are you all out of your mind out there?! By the

way, my father was a miner, and my brother is a miner—so why does a miner not have a right to a glass of beer after the shift?

I wrote a memorandum to the Politburo, and we had a heated conversation—I will not hide the fact that I took some beating. Some comrades, however, saw my point, and finally the anti-alcohol rage started to subside.... By the way, I see the root of such a problem as drinking—as well as many other troubles we have—in the decline of morals.

[Makartsev] Nikolay Ivanovich, you have been baptized; were your parents believers? We now have the Law on Freedom of Conscience. What other debts, in your opinion, does Russia still have to pay to the church and to the people who want to follow the faith of their grandfathers and fathers?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, I have been baptized; my grandmother and grandfather were believers—moderately so, as is the bulk of the population in our country. My attitude toward the church? In my view, its destruction had become one of the most powerful blows to the moral foundations of our nation. I see the destruction of churches and cathedrals, many of which were architectural masterpieces, as an immoral act. The clergy is gradually getting involved in the life of society, and I welcome it. Of course, I personally will not walk around with a candle in my hands; however, I do respect, and will continue to do so, the opinion of the clergy and the church.

[Makartsev] Finally, whom are we going to see on your presidential team? And what about a vice president in case of... do you, as they say, have someone in mind? Where will we see and hear you in May?

[Ryzhkov] We are still deliberating on it....

Western Republics

Minsk Committee Decides To Suspend Strike

OW2405035391 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1800 GMT 23 May 91

[Text] According to the Minsk strike committee, on Thursday 11 enterprises were on strike in Belorussia, including 9 in Mogilyov and 2 in Orsha. There were localized walkouts at several of Minsk's enterprises in protest of “the management's repressions against the participants in the political strikes”.

In the evening a sitting of the strike committee decided to suspend the strike and prepare the collection of signatures in the republic to express non-confidence to the Belorussian Supreme Soviet, to demand new elections on a democratic basis and to drop plans to institute Belorussian presidency at the current session.

According to the strike committee, the introduction of the presidency will inevitably lead to a dictatorship, given the lack in the republic of a powerful political opposition.

Ukrainian Cabinet Appointments Examined

LD2305210291 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian
2200 GMT 2 May 91

[Summary] The session of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet continued its work in Kiev today. Legislative reporters Volodymyr Slipko and Serhiy Hubin reported from the legislature.

People's deputies honored the personality of Academician Sakharov at the beginning of the session and then turned to discussing candidacies to the Cabinet of Ministers. Vitold Fokin presented candidacies for first deputy prime minister, deputy prime minister, secretary of state, and some state ministers. Fokin proposed Kostyantyn Masyk, one of the leaders of the former administration, for the post of first deputy prime minister. Candidacy of Oleksandr Maselskyy, the chairman of the Kharkov oblast soviet of people's deputies, was suggested for the post of deputy prime minister. Vitold Fokin was criticized as he had promised to have an agriculture expert as one of his deputies. The legislators considered Oleksandr Tkachenko, who was responsible for issues of agricultural policy in the Ukrainian Council of Ministers, appropriate for this position. Fokin argued that Tkachenko would be indispensable as a state minister of agriculture. Masyk was appointed first deputy prime minister and he will deal with issues connected to the Chernobyl catastrophe. Oleksandr Maselskyy was approved for the post of deputy prime minister. Volodymyr Kykhota will hold the position of the secretary of state. Viktor Antonov was appointed state minister for issues of defense complex and conversion. Anatoliy Minchenko has received the posts of state minister and minister for economic issues.

People's deputies continued examining key points of the draft concept of the new constitution. The name Constitution of Ukraine was approved by the people's deputies. Regarding the name of our republic, the people's deputies agreed that citizens of the Ukraine will determine it through a referendum. The deputies agreed on the right of citizens for private property, preservation of the territorial order of the republic, and presidential rule. It was noted that the president has to be elected by means of a national, direct, and secret ballot. Presidential powers can be terminated only by means of a national referendum. People's deputies decided that the Supreme Soviet should consist of a single chamber and work on a permanent basis—not intermittantly. Issues regarding relations with the Crimean Autonomous Socialist Republic were also discussed.

Clashes, Arrests Reported in Moldova

OW2305053591 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1130 GMT 22 May 91

[Text] Speaking on Moldavian television the republic's Prime Minister Mircha Druk has said that certain forces have launched a campaign against his Government. He claimed that last autumn "instructions from Moscow were intercepted" (he did not specify their form) demanding his removal from the political arena.

"Though our opponents threatened to do away with the new Government in three months, he emphasised, we have withstood for almost a year."

There were clashes in Kishinev on Tuesday evening between the police and supporters of Mircha Druk. Demonstrators were wounded, arrests were made. They protested against the attempts of several parliamentary factions, including Communists and farmers, to dismiss the Prime Minister.

Moldovan Legislature Views Candidates

OW2405084891 Moscow INTERFAX in English
0930 GMT 23 May 91

[Text] The Moldavian parliament is expected to begin the discussion of the candidates to the post of Prime Minister today. Last night it brought a vote of no confidence to Premier Mircha Druk by secret ballot.

In response thousands of people took to the streets in Kishinev protesting against the parliamentary decision.

According to IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent, some demonstrators felt that the vote signifies the beginning of a coup to restore the old order. Druk is supported by the Popular Front [PF]. The PF faction in parliament left the hall during the voting. Opposed to Druk is the influential farmers' faction supported by the Moldavian president Mircha Snegur, who said after the beginning of demonstrations on Wednesday that he will not submit to the pressure of the streets.

Caucasus

Armenian Council on Emergency Situation Meets

NC2305212491 Yerevan Radio Yerevan Network
in Armenian 1730 GMT 22 May 91

[Text] The Republican Temporary Council on the Emergency Situation continued its work on 22 May at a regular session chaired by Vazgen Manukyan, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Armenian Republic. Babken Ararktsyan, first deputy chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, briefed the council on the living conditions of the people temporarily (?residing) in Goris and on efforts being made to enable them to return to their homes.

It was pointed out that, based on agreements reached during negotiations with high-ranking military officials,

military guard posts have already been set up in four Gadruyskiy villages to protect residents.

Babken Ararktsyan also reported on the visit to France by the Armenian delegation headed by Armenian Supreme Soviet Chairman Levon Ter-Petrosyan. He said that before Levon Ter-Petrosyan's meeting with President Mitterrand, First Deputy Chairman Grant Bagratyan had a series of useful meetings with a number of French officials.

Gagik Arutyunyan, deputy chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, then briefed the council on the steps being taken in Yerevan and in Moscow to present a comprehensive picture of the situation in Armenia and Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] to the Russian Republic's people's deputies session. Studying the (?steps being taken) to secure the release of illegally detained people in Armenia and Artsakh, the council decided that the Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium should suggest to the Russian Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium that the issue of [words indistinct] the criminal acts against them be raised with the appropriate institutions. It was pointed out that a group of people who had been illegally detained were released after efforts were made on their behalf.

A wide-ranging exchange of views took place on the topics which will be submitted for discussion and endorsement at the upcoming session of the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet. Topics concerning political developments in the republic were also discussed.

Plight of 'Deported' Karabakh Armenians Protested

PM2305123391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
22 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[Sergey Bablumyan report: "Refugees' Bitter Fate"]

[Text] Yerevan—Around 1,000 deported residents of villages in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] are still in Armenia's Gorisskiy Rayon, which borders Azerbaijan.

IZVESTIYA was told by Babken Ararktsyan, first deputy chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, that the refugee situation is near desperate. People have been left homeless and without means of support. The fate of many of the refugees' relatives, who hid in the woods of the NKAO's Gadruyskiy Rayon, is unknown too.

"We are trying," Babken Ararktsyan continued, "to get the military command to carry out its promise to guarantee people's safe return to their homes, but all our efforts have come to nothing. Not a single representative of any competent body has shown any interest in meeting with the refugees, hearing them out, or satisfying people's legitimate demands."

Robert Aleksanyan, chairman of the Gorisskiy Rayispolkom [Rayon Soviet Executive Committee], told me over the phone that old men, women, and children had

been living in extremely difficult conditions for five days. We are doing everything possible to provide them with food and to organize medical services, [he said,] but there are far more problems than there are opportunities to solve them. The situation is compounded by shelling from the other side of the border. There are many unexploded bombs lying around in the fields and the peasants are scared to go to work.

On 20 May the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium issued a statement to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and to Union and autonomous republic Supreme Soviets. In particular, it requested that they urgently send representatives to the Armenia-Azerbaijan border and strive to obtain the return home of deported Armenians.

Armenian-Azerbaijani Border Situation Reported

PM2305143191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 23 May 91 First Edition p 1

[Report by Colonel V. Kaushanskiy: "Light at End of Tunnel?"]

[Text] Yerevan—To assert that a lull is ensuing in the border rayons of Armenia and Azerbaijan is, unfortunately, still risky. Spontaneous bursts of fire are accompanied by no less noisy items in the press which continue to discredit the subunits of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and Soviet Army troops fulfilling the well-known decree of the country's president. Here Armenia continues to be presented in the local press as "the victim of state terrorism on the part of the USSR."

At the same time one cannot but agree with the opinion voiced by L. Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet, at a 19 May news conference. He noted that in the explosive rayons a relative easing of the situation can be noted and that "in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast there are serious political forces prepared for dialogue with the Azerbaijani side on the question of settling the conflict."

For instance, a meeting took place in Shaumyanovsk between the republican committee for the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and inhabitants of Armenian nationality. The latter demanded that internal troops posts be set up outside the city, guaranteeing their safety. There was a meeting of local inhabitants in the region of the Karachinar population center—Armenians and Azerbaijanis—and they agreed on the main thing: A truce is needed, and the sooner the better. In the opinion of the Armenian side, the armed groupings of both warring "banks" present an equal danger.

The attempts at dialogue, which includes people's diplomacy in its orbit, can only be welcomed as, indeed, can the recent statement made at a meeting in Yerevan by L. Ter-Petrosyan concerning the inadmissibility of hostile actions against the Transcaucasus Military District units and individual servicemen. It has even been promised that the criminals will be labeled enemies of the nation.

It is nonetheless impossible to agree with his claim that there are no armed forces that are not controlled by the Supreme Soviet on the territory of the republic.

Azerbaijan, Armenia Cease-Fire Deals Cited

PM2305145991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 May 91 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report from PRAVDA, TASS, RIA, INTERFAX roundup under general headline: "In the Country"]

[Text] Major General V. Shironin, deputy chief of the KGB's Second Main Directorate, told journalists yesterday at the USSR KGB Public Relations Center that several rayons of Azerbaijan and Armenia have signed cease-fire agreements as a result of mediatory efforts made by personnel from this and other departments. No shots have rung out in the vicinity of the settlement of Sadarak or in Yekhegnadzorskiy, Babekskiy, Shakhbuzskiy, and certain other rayons in the two republics since 9 May.

Azerbaijan Urges RSFSR To Show Respect

LD2305194391 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1245 GMT 22 May 91

[Text] Baku, 22 May. (AZINFORM-TASS)—The legislature of Azerbaijan (the Soviet republic in Transcaucasia) has expressed bewilderment at the fact that relations between Azerbaijan and Armenia are to be discussed at the fourth Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Congress of People's Deputies. The Supreme Soviet of the republic resumed its work today after a break of more than two months.

The deputies who spoke pointed out that they approve the energetic measures taken for the restoration of Russia's sovereignty. Azerbaijan, however, while maintaining a respectful attitude toward the constitutional rights of all the republics including the Russian Federation, is justified in counting on the same respectful attitude toward its own sovereignty.

The Supreme Soviet of Azerbaijan has adopted a statement that stressed that no Union republic takes priority over another and cannot assume authority over questions relating to the sovereign rights and territorial supremacy of other republics. Therefore, the Azerbaijan legislature has expressed hope that the congress will show political wisdom and will not allow its actions to encroach on the rights of a sovereign republic.

After that, the deputies discussed questions of forming the cabinet of ministers, the draft laws on the employment of the population, and the principles of the economic independence of the Azerbaijan Republic. The deputies will also discuss the draft treaty on the Union of the sovereign republics.

Mutalibov Meets With USSR's Velichko, Anfimov

NC2405104891 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri
1700 GMT 23 May 91

[Text] The press office of the Azerbaijan Republic's presidency has disclosed that on 23 May, President Ayaz Mutalibov met with Velichko, USSR first deputy prime minister, and Anfimov, USSR minister of electrical equipment industry and instrument making. During the meeting, which was practical in nature, a critical study of the social and political situation in the USSR as a whole and in various parts of the Soviet Union was made and important current problems were discussed. It was noted during the exchange of views that strengthening relations among republics and consolidating their links with the central organs is the only correct way to resolve years-old problems, including economic ones and lifting the country's economy and the economies of individual regions to a contemporary level.

The participants noted that the important current realities must be considered for progressive management of the economy and for the adoption of new economic forms.

Azerbaijan Prime Minister Gasan Gasanov attended the meeting.

Azerbaijan Presidium Names Council of Ministers

NC2405105791 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri
1700 GMT 23 May 91

[Excerpts] The first session of the 12th convocation of the Azerbaijan Republic Supreme Soviet resumed its work today. Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Chairwoman El'mira Kafarova chaired the meeting. [passage omitted]

Our legislative correspondent Mursel Mustafayev made the following report:

[Begin recording] Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Chairwoman El'mira Kafarova chaired today's session. She said that the Supreme Soviet's permanent commissions and committees have continued their deliberations on the new structure and composition of the council of ministers and submitted the list of the candidate members of the new government.

The speakers said that an active and fair debate on the Council of Ministers' candidates would provide for more rapid economic and social development for the republic. It was noted, however, that because the structure of the council of ministers was approved in accordance with the proposals a day before the session began, the matter cannot be debated again. The deputies also examined the candidate members of the Council of Ministers separately and agreed that they should be appointed to the appropriate posts.

The session approved the appointment of Magomed Asadov as minister of internal affairs; Talyat Kasumov as minister of health; Guseyn Sadykhov as minister of

foreign affairs; M. Abdullayev as minister of agriculture and food supply; Polat Bulbuloglu as minister of culture; Ratib Feyzullayev as minister of popular education; Salih Gadzhiyev as minister of land reclamation and water resources; Shamil Musayev as minister of communications; Agha-Salim Bagirov as minister of trade; Bedir Karayev as minister of finance; Rakhim Dzhamilov as minister of grain products; Alisaib Orudzhiev as minister of justice; Arif Aslanov as minister of motor transport; Veniamin Mayorov as minister of housing and municipal services; A. Abdullayev as minister of local industry; and Lidiya Rasulova as minister of social security. The deputies also approved the appointment of the heads of the state committees.

A detailed report will be published in the newspapers on the composition of the republic's Council of Ministers. [passage omitted] [end recording]

Central Asia

Russia, Kazakhstan Complete Talks on Accords

PM2205161391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
22 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[Eduard Matskevich report: "Cooperation Program Amended"]

[Text] Alma-Ata—A representative Russian Government delegation headed by I. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, has visited the Kazakh capital.

The aim of the visit was to work out a mechanism for implementing bilateral agreements and jointly amending them. The head of the Russian Government was received by Kazakh President N. Nazarbayev. During the talk it was noted that specific bilateral accords will allow the republics to more rapidly and reliably bring order to what are, in a number of cases, unbalanced economies, and to organize fulfillment of commitments for material and technical supply and other supplies.

Following the talks between the government delegations, Kazakh Prime Minister U. Karamanov and I. Silayev signed a protocol on examining progress in fulfilling agreements between the RSFSR and the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] on economic cooperation in 1991.

It was not a question of reciprocal complaints but of how to improve fulfillment of commitments to ensure that both sides satisfy as fully as possible the interests of the national economies of Russia and Kazakhstan, U. Karamanov said.

Prime Minister Pavlov Visits Tashkent 22 May

LD2205231891 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program
Radio-1 Network in Russian 1900 GMT 22 May 91

[Text] USSR Prime Minister Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov arrived in Tashkent tonight. According to Valeriy Kiosa, our special reporter, over the next few days the prime minister will visit enterprises of the republic, visit Karakalpakiya, and also hold talks with the republic's leadership. It is expected that leveling of starting conditions in various republics during the transition to a market economy, and also aid that will be given by the union government in connection with the natural disaster that struck Uzbekistan yesterday, will be among the main topics discussed.

Comments on Reason for Tour

LD2305182291 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 1500 GMT 23 May 91

[Valeriy Kiosa and Erkin Rakhumov report]

[Text] As we have already reported, USSR Prime Minister Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov is now in Uzbekistan.

As we transmit this report Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov and the republican leaders accompanying him are in the Aral Sea zone, which is experiencing an ecological disaster. The situation in the region has also been exacerbated by the fact that over the past few days the Kara-Kalpak Republic and northern Khorezm were hit by heavy rain, hail, and gusting winds. The elements did enormous damage to the national economy and the people living here need help.

Contrary to the view that is sometimes expressed it is quite obvious today that the Aral Sea tragedy is not just a private tragedy or a localized one. Therefore it needs to be solved by joint work and collective effort.

After his arrival in Tashkent Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov gave an interview to all-union radio.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified reporter] Valentin Sergeyevich, what is the main purpose of your trip here? How would you describe it?

[Pavlov] As you know we are still working on issues connected with the transition to a market economy. However, a major complex problem still exists—the the different starting conditions due to reasons that are not connected with the people living and working in the various areas. For a great many years—at least 60 years—we pursued specialization in different spheres stemming from general tasks. But now that market relations are coming into play fairness and unfairness are arising in this respect, you see, because the market is quite a dynamic thing; it is not indeed always fair to the historical past. This issue needs above all to be viewed specifically to see how this is developing.

Second, of course, my visit has been accelerated above all by the totally unexpected troubles that have happened on Uzbek soil. It is necessary to take a look and on the spot determine how and in what way we can assist the Uzbek people and somehow provide support at this difficult time. One cannot leave people to extricate themselves from trouble by their own efforts alone. Afterall, our friendship is, as they say, no new thing and at times of trouble you learn who your friends are. That has always been said and that is the way it has always been with our people. That is fair. [end recording]

Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan Sign Accord

*LD2205125391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 0900 GMT 22 May 91*

[Text] An agreement on cooperation and mutual aid has been signed by Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. The agreement is solely of an economic nature. Thus far 14 towns and rayons have signed it. But anyone who wants can join. This document is yet another sign that the century-long traditions and customs of people inhabiting these republics have a great deal in common.